

## Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 06/03/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 6/3/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 6/3/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:05:50 PM]

>> Kitchen: Call to order the meeting of the mobility committee at 3:05 which is pretty good. So okay, our first order of business is approval of the minutes. From the April 29th meeting. We have councilmember Gallo moved and councilmember Zimmerman second. All in favor. The minutes are approved. Next, citizen communications and we have speakers signed up. For three minutes each. To address issues that are -- items that are not posted on the agenda. So if anyone wants to speak to items that are on the agenda, they will be signing up under those individual items. Citizen communications. We -- first we have glen, glen gannet. Okay. And -- >> Is the mic on? >> I'm glen, we've established a new company. A taxi franchise we want to get started in Austin. Our business plan anticipates that we get 100 permit, half of that fleet would be hybrid vehicles which we can ensure -- ensure that go the peak demands of the city are met. The other 50 vehicles would be either hybrid or flex fuel. We're going to have incentives for drivers to purchase hybrid vehicles by giving a thousand toward that purchase. We're going to have -- provisions to permit a driver to have a week off for vacation that's paid as well as to have time up to a week if they have a car that's -- based on uninsured

[3:07:50 PM]

motorists. So we think this kind of company Philadelphias perfectly with the city's mandate and desire to have zero emissions. We think this is a perfect timing to be able to come into the marketplace because of the co-opt request and because of Uber and we believe the demand supports it. That there's a specialized need and demand based on people who want to use the services of a hybrid car as a taxicab company. The dilemma I have is we attempted to present our transportation -- our applications to the transportation committee -- or, department, but they said because there's an ongoing city ordinance that prohibits any future frap, this is 2009 or something, to be considered, I'm using this venue to be able to present our intent to be able to operate a taxi franchise in Austin. And so I'm asking for the mobility committee to consider that request of ours and we can qualify with regard to the demands under the formal -- the exist didding structure of a taxi franchise. We -- let me see my notes on that. You know, the benefit of a taxi franchise versus Uber or lift Lyft is this background check. To ensure that insurance has been covered and we're going to follow the protocol of the city mandates. For example, f1 gives priority to hybrid vehicles on taxis at events and dovetails perfectly into events that the city is organizing. F 1, all of the events that happen throughout the year. So hoping the committee -- >> Kitchen: I have a question, and see in anyone else does. You're talking about a franchise

[3:09:51 PM]

that would be 100% green fleet in the sense of hybrid and or electric. >> Not electric, we don't -- >> Kitchen: Okay, hybrid. >> 50% of the permits would be company owned. Hybrid. The other 50 would be owner operator. We would give them incentives to purchase hybrid vehicles. Our goal, ultimately is to go all hybrid and thereafter to go battery operated if the technology permits. Of course, there's going to be an issue with regard to the vans for handicap accessibility. And that is that those vehicles really don't have the technology to handle, support hybrid right now or battery operated. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> We have a dedicated component to our fleet to handicap vans that the city believes is appropriate as far as the percentage goes. >> Kitchen: Does anyone have questions. Go ahead. >> Gallo: Thank you for being here. Two mention you were operating in other cities? >> No brand new, starting in Austin. >> Gallo: Are there franchise companies in Austin that use hybrids? >> I believe they do. I don't -- I don't believe they have a mandate in their business plan to operate company-owned vehicles as hybrid only. >> Gallo: Okay. >> My understanding is they recently purchased a fleet of four-door Fords, large sedans that are hybrid operated. We think it's consistent with the city's desire for zero emissions. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Kitchen: Further questions? >> Zimmerman: I've made comments from the dais that the taxi franchises are adversely affected with the new technology, with the more and

[3:11:52 PM]

more smartphones and gps on them. Are you not concerned about the business model and technology kind of changing the way franchises are feasible? >> I think there's a niche for us with regard to hybrid. I think there's going to be a significant component of ridership that wants to gravitate toward our businessman and being able to it say I'm reducing that imprint of carbon or emissions and no, I think our business plan, you know, will survive. >> Kitchen: Other questions? Okay, what we will do is check in with staff to see what the process is for what we would have to do is open up additional permits. And we -- what we have on the table right now is moving forward with the knee franchises that we have. >> Right. >> Kitchen: We've also passed a resolution requesting the staff to come back to us with a co-opt model. A driver-owned co-opt model. So we'll check with staff and see what our other options might be and get back to you. >> Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Mr. Oakley. And after bill it's black walkers. Thank you. >> Thank you very much. I'm bill Oakley with Austin affordability.com and at one of your previous meetings I brought up this issue of having a drawing system set up, a lottery system for some of the mopac lanes scheduled to open late this year. I'm proposing some of that vehicle capacity be allocated by way of a lottery system that would perhaps rotate every two or three months to allow some of the Austin commuters who were

[3:13:52 PM]

first priced out of their hoax into the suburbs and now find themselves priced out of long-awaited traffic relief and ctrma on the website, mentions the possibility of a \$4 toll but don't say when it might kick in, but the bottom lines, the higher the traffic, the higher the toll, and so some people referred to in this as a Lexus lane model. Even at \$4, it would cost \$168 a month for a commuter to go it to and from work with these new lanes and I don't think that's fair to the people who have waited so long for traffic relief and they've been long time Austin residents and they're out in the suburbs and it doesn't work for them and doesn't help them. So this proposal made the rounds of some council offices and there's been discussion back and forth what can be done to improve it. So I've gotten some improvements worked into this revision and I'd like for you all to consider. I know Ms. Kitchen, when you and I met, you don't have another meeting until August and the toll road may open at the end of the year, so you were

thinking possibly of inviting C.T. Ram to review -- ctram and comment on it. I know it would be a high mountain to climb to suggest a plan like this, that's out of the bottom and yet, the mayor called for innovative thinking to meet the affordability changes we have and I feel this proposal does that, and it's being reviewed by the mayor's office and some of the other council office so I hope you'll give it thorough consideration and before I leave, I want to use my remaining time to ask you to also consider protected walks for pedestrian at some of our intersections. A woman was killed at third and

[3:15:54 PM]

congress this past week and I was almost hit at that very same intersection. I had a green light, the white walk light was on and a car came at me, making a left turn, from across from me and crossed in front of me in broad daylight and if I haven't jumped out of the way in the nick of time, I would not be standing here today. That's another issue that needs to be looked at carefully. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much U thank you, Mr. Oakley, I know the question of -- as people people and cars is very important. Thank you for bringing that to our attention. >> I hope etch takes a look at the mopac proposal. >> Kitchen: Any questions? >> Zimmerman: It's an interesting idea, lottery idea you had here, the lottery winners. What's interesting is that anyone could put in for lottery. I live in northwest Austin, would I be able to enter the lottery. What would be the lottery pool and part of where I'm going with this, some people that won the lottery would have more of a need to use mopac than others. >> I have given that had thought and others raised that same question. Thank you for asking. I don't think you could do any means testing on the people that apply for this. I think the goal would be to encourage long-term residents who are daily commuters to apply for it. But, you know, anyone would could apply, because you wouldn't be able to restrict it, I don't believe. In any feasible way. The other good thing about it, all they would have to do, all ctmra would have to do would be to enter the tags into the computer system and the people who won, I think the best way to handle that, continue to give those people a variable toll but

[3:17:54 PM]

put an affordable cap on that toll. So it's still variable but the computer is programmed to say, okay, if this is a lottery winner, their toll is capped at a certain rate. And by the way, not all of the roadway capacity would go to the lottery. Just a reasonable portion of it because you have people who need to use the lanes for other -- for other purposes to get to a meeting on time or you know go and meet their family, whatever the deal is. So you would just establish a number, a workable number of these slots that are available as part of the MIX. Just an opportunity to provide some affordability that would not others otherwise be there. >> Zimmerman: We're going to be confronted shortly with the idea of taxicab permits for the franchises. And we don't know what that number should be, we've had some formulas that we've tried to come up with to figure out what's a reasonable number for taxicab permits. I don't know. So I think what's before us today shortly, we were proposing to eliminate the formula put in place and estimate it in some other way. So I think the argument that may be ctmra is making, the number is to mysterious. A cap that's affordable for one person is not for another. So -- >> Well, I don't think the service tolls are going to be affordable for a lot of people priced out of their homes. This requires discussion, and requires some public input and analysis by possibly your staff and C.T. Ram, but it's an opportunity that needs to be looked at and if you try it, you might have to tweak it as as it moves planning. But if you consider every new road proposed in Austin's future is going to be express lanes on

[3:19:54 PM]

it, that's going to create a huge affordability challenge and if they tell you the mopac south lanes are four or five dollars, all you have to do is do a Google search, \$8, \$10, \$12 tolls for express lanes all over the United States. We have a serious question whether that model fits the values of the people in Austin, I don't believe it does, unless we find a way to tweak it to make it affordable for some of our residents. But thank you for your time. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Mr. Hiden. Which way? >> Hayden. >> Kitchen: Okay, and Hayden and next Joseph. >> I'm Hayden, urban planner and chair of the city's pedestrian advisory council, speaking on behalf of myself and in my work on the council, I see multiple presentations about the sidewalk program and the update that's coming to the master plan and I just wanted to tell that you I'm really impressed with your sidewalk staff, they have a limited budget and really done great things and I think if we try to build a city that's better for all transportation users, that's safe and comfortable and convenient for everybody, including pedestrians, our sidewalk system is really important. So I wanted to put a little bug in your ear. My understanding, most of the sidewalk program is funded through 2012 bond money and that money is about to run out. And I would suggest that I think it would be better if we could fund that program in a more permanent sort of way, and then maybe bond money could be used for special projects but I think it would be really nice to know we had funding to continue the great work that your staff is already doing on the sidewalk

[3:21:55 PM]

program. >> Kitchen: Question? >> Gallo: You're the sidewalk experiment. >> Oh, well. >> Gallo: I'm intrigued with the shared pedestrian-bike sidewalk that's just right down the street. >> The Armstrong bike way. >> Gallo: By the football field, the pop Warner football field. >> Kitchen: Was -- >> Gallo: To me, it's appealing we get the bicycles off the road where it's much safer for them to be off the road. So I was curious what the pedestrian point was of being able to share. I mean it's, obviously, much wider and it's directional, but I would be curious the pedestrian viewpoint would be. It seems like it serves good purposes to get both pedestrians and bikes off the >> I'll roads. Tell you that I'm a bicycle chicken. So I ride on the sidewalk wherever it's legal. And for me, I think it's a great shared use. I know some don't believe that and part of the problem is you have different kind of bicyclists. People like me not going fast who really want to be out of traffic and you have others who are riding it 25, 30 miles an hour who can negotiate traffic but I would say as long as everybody is respectful, I mean, I think there's some issues like on a bike trail and only a trail you're talking about, but mostly able to work those out and I would think we're all adults and can work it out and it me, it's safer for everybody to be out of the path of cars. >> Gallo: Thanks for your opinion on that. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Our last speaker for citizen community is Joseph. >> My name is Joseph eiley. >> Kitchen: Sorry. >> I'm here to report that house

[3:23:58 PM]

bill 2440 failed on the house floor and I'm here to demand that the city either do, one or the other. And that is if I, the pedi cab, the limo driver, the horse carriage operator, the -- if we have to get a fingerprint background check and a driving record and we all got to pay that office over there to be able to operate, they will too, and if they don't, we don't! It's that simple. Either make it fair across the board or get rid of the whole department. And make it a wild wild west out there. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Thank you very much and as he's noting, he's talking about the bill that would have regulated tncs at a state level, that did not pass and we're aware of that, I expect our committee will weight into those issues -- wade into those issues at our August meeting. That was my thinking, so -- okay, so we'll move on. I'm going to suggest we take the items a little out of order so we can address the taxicab issues first. Which would be items 4, 5, 6, 7 and we'll take them up all at once. Let me sort of -- what I'm going to do first is just bring us all up to speed and remind everyone where we've been. And I also want food welcome

councilmember tovo. For joining us on our committee for this aspect of our agenda. So what we have -- what we've done is passed out information at the front that -- or a

[3:25:59 PM]

proposed set of changes. I'm going to first go over our process again and then go over the proposed changes for us to discuss today. And then we'll go from there with our speakers. First off, as a reminder to everyone, we're looking at two things. Franchise agreements which are actually the ordinances that extend the agreements between the city and the taxicab companies. And then we're also looking at changes to our code that regulates taxicab companies and drivers. So we have gotten as far as second reading at the last council meeting, we approved a franchise agreement on second reading and approved code changes on second reading. Where we're at right now is the committee is considering recommendations to bring forward to the council meeting tomorrow the vote tomorrow will be third and final reading on the franchise agreements and the code amendments and we have them so far. So as a reminder on second reading what the council approved in the council meeting was changes to our code which would provide for the chauffeur's license being attached to the drivers, that's approved so far on second reading and it's -- it will be in the code changes for tomorrow. We also approved on second reading in the code changes that going forward the addition of -- additional permits would be based on performance measures and we made changes to extend the useable life of vehicles based on inspections. And then finally, passed a resolution asking staff to come back to us with a procedure for

[3:27:59 PM]

creating a driver-owned co-opt. So that's what we've done to date. What I have in front of you as proposed for discussion today additional amendments in addition to the ones we approved on second reading and those are broken out by changes to the franchise ordinance which impacts the franchise agreement with the three taxicab companies as well as additional changes to the taxi code. So first, and this is a sheet of paper available when you signed in. So -- first, on the changes to the taxi franchise ordinance, what is proposed for discussion today is to first require each of the franchises have a computerized dispatch system. The purple is to align all of the franchise agreements. One of the existing franchising agreements that is that requirement and the other two do not so this would align all three. The second thing is to extend the franchise agreements for a period of five years. What we've approved so far on second reading, first and second reading was one year and that was from my perspective a placeholder for discussion purposes and now what I'm proposing is that we put a five-year -- a five-year franchise extension term. Which tracks the last term which was five years. The third item is that in each of the franchises would be allocated an additional 50 permits in year one of the franchise extension. After that, any additional permits would be based again on compliance with performance measures to be approved by the council. And there would be no maximum number of permits included in the franchise agreements. So those are the proposed changes for the committee's discussion on the franchise

[3:30:00 PM]

ordinances. Now, on the code changes, let me lay those out. On code changes, most of these proposed code changes, facilities which is an item that we have been discussing in the last committee meetings and at council but not yet brought forward proposed changes. %-@So these are the proposed changes that are designed and the hope for them is to improve the accessibility to rides for persons with disabilities. So those include first, that there be an increase in the number of special accessible vehicle

permits. >> The permits for vehicles that are accessible. To 10% of total permits. That -- the current number is six to 6.5%. This increases it to 10%. The second area relates to some performance measures and that would be that -- that -- let's see. That the -- they maintain an average response time -- so that drivers that operating a vehicle -- an accessible vehicle would maintain an average response time of seven minutes of the average response time for standard request. And next, that for each driver driving an accessible vehicle they provide no less than 3% of the total modified ground transportation service trips monthly. I'm going to go through these and if people have questions, I'll ask staff to come up and provide more detail. And then finally, that the department would consider -- the department would develop penalties for failure to perform with these standards and that would come back to us. So those are the proposed changes as they relate to access for persons with disabilities.

[3:32:02 PM]

A number of other changes would involve -- let's see. See. Oh, the other changes have to do with performance measures. On second reading what we said was that -- or what we passed was that in order to determine the number of additional permits that are available to taxicab company, instead of that being based on a formula, going forward it would be based on compliance with performance measures approved by council and these code changes include two of those performance measures. Additional performance measures would be developed. Those two, one is compliance with the requirement that I just read, related to access for persons with disability ISES. And the second would be hold a state or local contract for transportation services provided to a healthcare program. Such as medicaid. And the final code -- area of code changes, additional consideration factors for the staff when considering a franchise application and those are listed here. The accuracy of the applicant's data reports, the quality of dispatch service, compliance with the Ada. Fuel efficiency and any and all fees that the applicant charges to drivers. The consideration factors as part of the franchise application process. Those are being brought forward and I brought these forward as proposals for the committee to consider. The committee can choose to write one or more of these to the council tomorrow and it's up to the council to vote tomorrow on what we would go forward with. I also want to say there have been additional requests. And recommendations related to due process and lease cap. At this point, we -- the committee will -- will -- is

[3:34:03 PM]

very interested in hearing from our speakers on any comments that you all would like to make about any of these proposed changes, about due process, about lease caps or anything else you'd like to talk with us about. But today, we don't have a proposal in front of us to vote on related to due process and lease caps though I do expect there will be proposals brought forward tomorrow at full council to address those issues. So with that said, before we start taking testimony is there anything that the staff would like to say to clarify any of this? Would you like to come forward. >> Chair kitchen, quickly I wanted to add, think I think probably a full discussion before the full council, so I wouldn't -- I think it's going to have to be debated again in front of full council, rather than pick it apart as a committee. That's just my thoughts. >> Kitchen: The full committee could vote to move in forward. We do expect -- and I want to let everyone who is here know, that we expect a full discussion of all of these issues in front of the council as a whole tomorrow. So -- okay. >> Gordon, assistant director of the Austin transportation department. When we previously put on the less than 3% of the total dispatch trips that was based on the 6 to 6.5%. We probably need a different formulation, we will need a different formulation, there will be one franchise close to 350 accessible vehicles and we can't really have 150% that -- all 350 vehicles getting 3% is

[3:36:05 PM]

150%. So probably needs to be a different formulation there for that minimum. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And the simplest thing to take the average. So if they have 50 permits on average that's 2%, probably cut that in half to 1% for the bell curve so it would be .5 times 100 -- the goal for each of the franchises, it would vary but that way it would expand and contract as the number of accessible vehicles. >> Kitchen: In other words, and first off, the point behind that requirement in the first place is to make certain that the trips are spread across all the drivers and not concentrated in a smaller number of drivers, if I'm understanding correctly. That's the purple behind the requirement. >> And to ensure all of the people with those accessible permits are actually providing trips to the accessible community. >> Kitchen: Okay, do y'all have any questions about his comments on the 3%? >> Zimmerman: Is there anyone from legal here that could talk to us about I guess item 2, the applicant's compliance with the Americans with disabilities of 1990 and I know there was a decision three years ago in New York, it was New York City taxicab drivers, a lawsuit there and the supreme court overturned a lower court and said that the taxis were not public transportation. You know, like cap metro is and weren't required to comply. Do you have any update on the legal information? >> I don't have on that specifically but what I will say, not to say they're required or not, it's in the city's -- in the city's perspective, that's one aspect that would be

[3:38:08 PM]

evaluated. Not necessarily their compliance with I guess the spirit of that law. >> Zimmerman: So it's not necessarily mandated. Just that this would be an objective put into the policy. >> One of the many things to be considered does. >> Got it. The other question I had about the 3% -- yeah, I was curious how that was computed. So if there were say, 100 trips and 97 trips had already been taken within a time periods, it a period of a month? Or what is the time period. >> I believe monthly. >> Zimmerman: So if you had done 96 trips for the month, can you not take any more trips until you have three trips with a disabled passenger or -- is that what that means? >> I anticipate -- I'm not sure I understand. But I think just the goal is that on average within every month, each driver that has an accessible vehicle, at least 3% of the accessible trips would be performed by that driver. >> Kitchen: Would you like to respond to that? >> Yes. Again, this was us looking at past data. There were some vehicles that took -- some cases steer trips during a month. So we -- zero trips during a month, so we wanted to set an expectation if you have this kind of permit, special and over and above the personalities that you get involved in -- we generally run it over a couple months average, this would be variations, but we would probably look at it at the end of the year or when franchises come up to make sure there's some equity. Probably when they ask for additional permits, we're going to ask are you carrying those trips, is everyone involved in that carriage. >> Kitchen: And as you said, earlier, you're suggesting this language be changed because 3% is not going to work in

[3:40:08 PM]

automatic instances and won't be flexible enough as the number of permits change. >> Right, we'll -- >> Kitchen: Guest proposed language, and are you suggesting -- can you say again what you're suggesting to replace that with? If we take 100 and divide it by the number of accessible permits, that would give us an average number of trips and cut that in half again, the bell curve so that we're, you know, it's going to be pretty rare we would be able to get an average for everybody. We think that's a place to start and if we need to adjust, we can do that. >> Kitchen: We would need revised language to reflect

that. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: We'll take a look at that. Should we go ahead with testimony and then -- okay. So, we have a -- we have requested testimony from our taxicab drivers from our taxicab franchises and from adapt. And we're going to go forward with testimony from these focus. And we'll start with -- folks, if I'm reading this, book batlin and Dave Passmore. Did you want to split your time. Did I see that correctly. Dave? >> [Inaudible] >> Kitchen: Did you want to share your time with bob yeah. Okay. >> We're going to [inaudible] >> Kitchen: Okay, just evenly between the four of you? Okay. Okay. All right, so let's start with Mr. Batlin. And so the time is 15 minutes divided by four.

[3:42:20 PM]

>> Chair kitchen, committee members, I'm bob, the leader with Austin interfaith. I listen to the testimony of the taxi companies with interest. Things they said were quite interesting. Drivers were making good money and long-term contract was needed because running a taxi company required investments and taxi drivers needed a five year term to be able to buy their cabs. Please note that the owner indicated that the drivers needed to finance their cars. Based on those remarks I've asked to you look at the finances differently. Specifically, where did the drivers get their money? What are their business expenses? Who owns the vehicles? Who pays for the vehicles? Who pays for the insurance? Who pays for dispatch? And who is incented to pay for dispatch? I think if you -- hearing the discussion of the people with disabilities, and looking at the dispatch requirement that you're putting in there, that is necessary but not sufficient to help that problem. Because having a dispatch system doesn't mean that anyone picks up anybody or goes anywhere. It's got to be deeper than that. And I think that more work has got to be taken on that. The five-year term is pretty troubling. And if the taxi drivers feel that five years is what they need to be able to finance their vehicles, that's fine. But I'm not sure what the taxicab companies need five years for. Because I don't see where they're spending money for the

[3:44:22 PM]

benefit of the taxicab customers in Austin. The accessibility concerns are critical and complicated. We need to make sure that any extension does not limit our ability to address those issues. I'm concerned if we go forward with a five-year plan without measures to that and service measures in general, we're not solving the problem. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Anyone have questions? >> Gallo: That is probably a question for staff or legal. You bring up a good point about the five year. Is there a way to do a term that includes a provision for a lookback halfway through or two years, where at that point, we could reevaluate perhaps pieces of this -- these changes that have perhaps unintended consequences that perhaps we need to readdress prior to the five-year term being over? And like I said, maybe that's a legal question. >> Kitchen: I think that's a legal question but I'd also like to say that also we should say at the same time that as you -- as you you may know, there are some provisions that are in the code and those code provisions can be changed at any time during the five years. It's the provisions that have to be in the franchise agreements themselves that are held static by the five years, if that makes sense. Maybe you could speak to what goes in -- what goes in the franchise versus the code and as well as responding to councilmember Gallo's question. >> Would I like to say from I believe part 10 of the proposed code amendment addresses in part the issue brought up.

[3:46:24 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. >> And it goes in tandem what with what you described in the franchise proposal to require the computerized positioning service and mirrored in that, part 10 would 13-2-455 response to dispatch service requests. While in service, a taxicab driver shall accept service requests when the

taxicab is determined by the dispatches global positioning service to be the closest taxicab to the pick July location. I believe that would address -- I believe that would address part of the concern, of not being picked up. >> Kitchen: The purpose of that provision is to -- the purpose is to address the concern Mr. Batlin raised. >> I apologize, I didn't hear the entirety of your question. >> Gallo: The gentleman who spoke before was concerned about the length of five years with the franchise term and my question was is there an ability to have a provision within the franchise agreement that allows the city, the council, to be able to come back during that period and make a policy change if something we're doing now perhaps has an unintended consequence that we didn't expect rather than have to wait the full five years. >> Absolutely, most of the policy changes that are being considered would be in code. Are the -- >> Gallo: Right, and I understand we can draft ordinances at any point to change those, but I'm concerned more with the franchise agreements. Is there a legal ability to put some type of language in the franchise agreement so if we run into an issue that needs to be readdressed within the five years, we would have the ability to do that to make amendments to the franchise agreement. >> We -- the city has the ability to amend the franchise at any time. The only caveat is that that has

[3:48:25 PM]

to be with the consent of the franchisee. So it goes out saying that the city can amend and the franchise and city can amend at any time. If you like I can add something more explicit stating at any period during the period of the franchise, the city due to an unforeseen consequence the city may amend. >> Kitchen: If I can restate that in a way that helps me. So basically, the franchise agreements are like contracts and so you can amend at any time, but it has to be an amendment that's mutually agreeable. There's no termination provisions without cause. For example, you can terminate during the five years with cause, or you can amend, at any time been within the five years as long as both parties agree to the amendment. >> Yes, ma'am, the charter says amendment only with consent. >> May I apologize, I apologize for not introducing myself earlier. >> Kitchen: Does that we are your question ganches sounds like if we wanted flexibility for unforeseen issues or problems that came up within the five years, there would be a provision added to the franchise agreement that allows to come back and redress that. >> Exactly understanding terms of city council, they have the ability in addition to the franchise stating that would put everybody open notice this is happening if there's any -- on notice if there's unforeseen consequence or detriment to the drivers or franchise holders, yes, I can do that, absolutely. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Kitchen: Mr. Passmore. Speaking next. And after Dave, we'll have ed carbo. Excuse me. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers.

[3:50:25 PM]

Dave with the taxi drivers' association. Today I would like to speak to two of the topics that are coming up on the agenda for to. Which would be a lease cap and a due process. Surrounding the lease cap, we're looking into where that could probably fit into an ordinance. Yeah? So we are for a lease cap. As far as the due process. What we're currently asking the drivers asking me to ask is this is placed in a standard contract. That the city and the franchises can come to some agreement with. So these two things today coming to members I would like to just address them and say we are for these two things. Like to see them come up tomorrow. We'll definitely be here for input as you asked for it and he we would move on from there. Now, another thing with these two issues, these two items, is that we would like them done within the same time frame as the renewal of the franchises. We're not against franchise renewal but we want our issues be placed in there so it's not another five years before these come up again. And the standard contract is something, I think staff and council and legal team could work on and if there's input needed from us, we're happy to share that with you. Thank you very much.

[Applause] >> Kitchen: Mr. Passmore. Let me ask did you a question. If you could -- when you're talking about due process, if you could give us some examples of some of the problems that you have experienced that you're interested -- that you're concerned about that you would like to address. >> Definitely, councilmember. Some of the problems that drivers are reporting back to us, things surrounding moving

[3:52:28 PM]

violation, which is already in the code. The code state for a moving violation. The traffic says we're trying to hold the drivers to a higher standard and we would terminate the contract 0 on two moving violations. Other things, red lights and cameras catching a driver going through a red light. And contract disputes that drivers may have with the franchises. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. Any questions. >> Thank you. >> Zimmerman: Before you go, can we go back to lease caps. I've asked this self times, I'm not 100% sure. When I hear lease cap that everybody knows we're talking about the same thing. Let's talk about lease caps for a minute. Exactly what it is. >> Okay. A lease cap is a cap, just like the city has in the ordinance, a cap on how many permits a particular franchise can hold of the ordinance states no one franchise should have more than 60% of the -- allocated permanents. We -- permits. We have understand that barrier has been breached somewhat and continues to be breached. So with that said, if there are rules in place, we just want to have drivers -- let me make that clear first. Drivers and franchises adhering to these rules. So when we said we're asking for a lease cap, is that it's extortionate rate that we continue to pay and can be increased by the franchises at any given time. There's no reason that they have not to increase the lease at any given time. So there's just going to be a notice placed in the next two weeks that the lease will be increasing by \$10 or \$15. >> Zimmerman: Again, what are we capping? >> Wee capping -- when I say

[3:54:28 PM]

lease cap, I want to be clear we're including all of our fees paid by drivers, that there's a cap on these fees. I'm not sure if I'm being clear. But I just want to be clear that there's nothing in place to prevent a franchise from increasing their lease at any given time. With the current landscape we're experiencing with the tncs entering into the transportation market, drivers' income continue to go down and if we don't have some protection in place to prevent that from happening we're continuing to pay fees to the franchises continuously without any repercussion or any measurement to say, okay, our lease is this much. It's not negotiable. It's just that the franchise said this is what it is and you have to agree to it. So we're asking that a cap be put on the current lease that we're paying. And there's no standard as far as a lease at any one of the franchises. Each franchise is different terminal fee and each franchise has a different lease fee. So we're just asking these Numbers -- yeah, it doesn't have to be today that we come up with these Numbers but we can sit down and come up with a sensible number is to where we can put a cap on that number and hold the charge in place for a period of time. We're not saying that the franchise cannot increase their lease. But they have to produce something to say why they're increasing their lease. >> Zimmerman: So I think when you say -- when you say lease, you're actually bundling in charges that the drivers have to pay not franchise company. And it's -- it's not necessarily a lease on a vehicle. It's not necessarily just the fee where you kind of lease or rented the permit. If you will, there could be a

[3:56:30 PM]

collection of charges, right? That the drivers are obligated to pay. A collection of charges. >>

Zimmerman: A group of charges. I hear, it's we need to limit our costs, as drivers. The costs need to be fixed. The problem I could never wrap my head around, how do you put that in writing into the agreement? Okay? That's what I'm asking for, I don't understand your taxi business. You know it backwards and forwards, I don't. >> Okay. >> Zimmerman: I've been asking and looking for something in writing that would be what you would call an acceptable lease call. That's what I'm asking for. >> Okay, and -- >> Zimmerman: Can you provide that? To me. From your point of view? [No audio] >> Kitchen: Did you have another question. Distance I wanted to indicate that -- >> Tovo: In meeting and talking with Mr. Passmore and others, my office is working on some suggested amendments and if it's appropriate, I'm happy to distribute them. Just bullet points but I believe what Mr. Passmore was saying and you can tell me -- what I believe might be achievable is not to figure out what that bundle of fees could be set at as a maximum by tomorrow, but we might be able to add some language into the different measures that we're considering tomorrow that would allow -- initiate a process to set that fee structure and have it be consistent and -- >> That's correct, councilmember, thank you for that clarification. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Our next speaker is Mr. Carbow: >> Good afternoon, councilmember, I'm president of yellow cab Austin.

[3:58:31 PM]

And I have with me Jerry Harris, a yellow cab attorney, he's represented our firm for 30 years. And he and I are available to answer any questions as we've, obviously, kind of delved into the legal realm. So we're here to answer questions. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I was hoping to happily announce we support what was written as the staff recommendations for franchise renewal and the mobility committee's recommendations for the third reading to the council. I think a lot of that has come together really well. You know, obviously, the recommendations that are presented today came out about 20 minutes before this meeting. I'd like to read through all of that -- >> Kitchen: Sure. >> -- And see how this comes together. Fundamentally, we support what's presented for no mobility >> On the issue of accessibility, the major problem is drivers currently refusing the request for service that are dispatched to them. The solution to this particular problem is addressed by part 9 of the staff franchise renewal recommendations. So we think that's a really good place to start to address those needs. A solution that would cost a significant amount of money, which would be merely increasing the number of wheelchair accessible vehicles, will not solve the root problem and is difficult to support entirely. So fundamentally the issue is trips are sent out to drivers who are in the business of providing service and trying to get them to go provide the service has been an issue. So if we address that root cause we can improve service drastically to those who need accessible vehicles without having to raise the percentage of vehicles from six and a half to 10%. We have no objections to the issuance of chauffeur's license directly to the drivers by the city without requiring a franchise to sponsor the driver. We also support the recommendation to allocate

[4:00:33 PM]

permit space on performance measures from the city staff that are approved by the city council. We're amenable giving our input regarding any due process procedures established by the city regarding suspending or canceling chauffeur's licenses. Our main concern is the safety of the public in regards to having safe cab drivers. We're in opposition to lease caps because it interferes with our ability to finance the business appropriately in this significantly more competitive environment. Our rates are in line with the industry and they allow us to invest in technology, marketing and insurance to operate a financially sound local business. So I know you guys may have lots of questions and Jerry and I are available to answer any and all questions you have. >> Kitchen: Okay. Any questions? >> Zimmerman: Thank you.

First question is what does lease cap mean to you? You've heard this discussion and the conversations we've been having. What does lease cap mean to you? >> Based on the statements that have been made and the language specifically, I would have to say it speaks to capping the leases that are charged to drivers. That's a really difficult thing to do because it has an impact on a business investing more to improve the product, but also look at the back end of it. So if a driver gets into an accident, they have a 2,000-dollar deductible and one of the things we try to do as a business is try to make sure that we encourage drivers to keep that number of accidents down. But if you would imagine a situation where you have a lease cap, the number of accidents in the fleet rises dramatically in a year and those costs increase dramatically, you cannot run a sound business, a sound local business where the business is eating up those costs without being able to say okay, as a message to the fleet we may need to raise the leases to make sure that there is significant awareness that

[4:02:34 PM]

we've got to keep accidents down. And obviously that factors into many other departments wanting to improve the marketing, investing in the hail a cab app, investing in the global positioning have systems that allow us to dispatch more effectively and efficiently. The technology is changing, the landscape is changing and we want the opportunity to compete effectively. >> I appreciate some of that explanation. You see part of my problem as a councilmember here trying to decide on policy issues. And we mentioned lease caps and we got into a discussion of insurance deductibles. And which I just want to underscore to you how difficult it is for me to understand how your business works. And where these conflicts are coming from. I appreciate that explanation. The other thing I would like you to [indiscernible], due process. So this word has been thrown out too, disagreements, labor. Labor management disagreements. It's like thousands of years old, these problems, labor-management, labor-management. If you could talk briefly about what that means to you when you hear due process that the taxi cab drivers want to write that in somehow to the ordinances or to the franchise agreements. If you could talk to that because I don't know. What's due process? I don't know. >> In attempting to address that I will say that as the franchise agreements are structured it's seemingly that the buck stops with the franchise. So the franchise is the responsible party. It sounds like the due process being proposed is creating a situation where if the franchise deems a driver to be a little bit more risky than they would want to deal with then the drivers are asking the city to implement a system that forces the franchise to continue [indiscernible] That driver to drive even though the franchise is the one that bears the risk. So as far as due process goes, I think it's a

[4:04:34 PM]

complicated issue to deal with. The truth of the matter is as our contracts are structured, we present those to the city. They're reviewed by the city. And I have not heard one substantiated claim about due process that somebody -- there are a lot of exaggerated claims that have been presented to council and I haven't seen a situation where somebody presents a claim to council -- I haven't heard one where it would warrant the council making a decision about whether or not that driver continues to drive. So the challenge is the city deciding who gets to drive, but then holding the franchise responsibility -- responsible if and when something goes wrong. >> So if I might ask a question there, so I think one of the components that sometimes gets discussed under due process is the criteria for which a driver may be terminated or suspended. And if I'm understanding you correctly, you're suggesting the taxi cab company needs some some level of discretion to determine when that termination or suspension might occur versus having the city determine when that occurs. Is that what I'm hearing you say? >> Certainly, councilmember kitchen. And in addition so that as I stated, we are amenable sitting down with the city

and having a conversation about the specific allegations and complaints and addressing those appropriately. >> Kitchen: Let me ask you this about the 10%. That's going back to your comment about the percentage of accessible vehicle permits, changes those from six and a half to 10 percent. So would that be as much concern to you if that 10% was phased in or is it your concern that it's going from six and a half to 10 all in

[4:06:34 PM]

one year? >> I actually think that's the best approach is to say let's implement the change to 13,475 which we've been talking about for four or five years now. Let's implement that change and that may solve the problem. And if that involves the problem then there's not a need to go from six and a half to 10 percent, but then obviously second quartering back to -- circling back to say if that doesn't solve the problem let's have a more lengthy conversation. >> Kitchen: Okay. Any other questions? Thank you. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you so much. In your comments you said a couple of times that you would be amenable sitting down with the city and talking about due process. And so one idea that's been proposed would be to have justice that kind of a conversation to -- but to require that there be a process spelled out whereby a driver would -- I'll get more specific about this later, but generally as a yellow cab representative you would be comfortable working with the city to look at due process as a general discussion. >> I would have to sit down with the city, city legal, any councilmembers that want to chime in and get all of that input to city staff, have all of that input dissected by that group and have that discussion. I'm happy to have that discussion. >> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay. Next would be Mr. Rosa. After him would be Solomon casa.

[4:08:42 PM]

My name is Antonio and I'm speaking for tda and many of the drivers of Austin. One of the things I would like to start off with is we are against any new permits going to the companies. I would like to further talk about lease cap. The lease cap, how I understand it, it would give us a certain stability, a stability that I do not have right now in my case. Many drivers do not have it. It is the single biggest expense I have a week. If I am not able to get that stability because it can be risen arbitrarily any time for no reason as we have heard, I am asking for city council to help me with this. If a driver approaches the company at the very beginning and challenges these prices, they just don't give them a car. Contracts are usually written with parties' equal strength. Here in Austin we have inequality of power. The way I see to rectify this, the only way to rectify this, is for city council to create an ordinance that specifically addresses this. And gives a process to create a way of installing a lease cap. We're open to any kind of process that will give a mechanism for this. If city council will please find a way to achieve this. Thank you. [Applause]. >> Kitchen: Questions? Okay. Solomon casa? Is Solomon here? >> He's not here right now dis. [Indiscernible]. >> Kitchen: He's not here? He couldn't make it.

[4:10:47 PM]

Okay. So then Mr. Matu. >> Actually, all my driver brothers and sisters are here. My name is vishu of the drivers alliance and we are part of the afl/cio. And I'm here today to kind of roundup what you heard from Dave and from Antonio and to answer any questions that you may have. I want to start by saying that what we are hearing clearly from council is that they want to move to a system where performance measures are in place and are clear, and that is how a franchise has to be evaluated whether it needs to be rewarded or not. And yet while we are admitting that the performance measures are not in place, that performance measures need to be reviewed, that performance measures need to be restructured,

even as that is part of what we're hearing, we're also hearing that the franchises are going to get 50 additional permits. Let's put the performance measures in place before we even think about giving people who have not delivered services to the city any reward. What is being specified is any contracts, for instance, any healthcare provider, et cetera, needs to be executed and we need to be careful about certain communities with disabilities, certain communities that need

[4:12:47 PM]

special services, et cetera. Now, if there was something very specific about that I can understand a 10, 20, 30 percent increase for that particular franchise, but as gender reward when we don't even have the performance measures clearly in place and the performance measures that exist have been challenged again and again by drivers it just makes no sense. So I want to articulate a position very clearly that we stand against any increases of permits to the three franchises. [Applause]. I want to start where Antonio left off. The primary thing he said was that a contract is negotiated and settled on between two parties with somewhat equal strength. When you have one party who does not have strength and another party who has got all the strength, the only situation that can develop is this party gets kicked around and has to sign what is put in front of him or her. [Applause]. I think all of you have to ask that question and fundamentally answer that. Our franchises and drivers with equal power. What Antonio said when he walked up here is if I challenge a figure, if I say but why is that figure being charged along with that? [Buzzer sounds] I think I have the 15 minutes. My comrades only spoke for about six minutes. >> It's a total of 15. >> So I have time. What Antonio said is if he says wait a minute, why am I getting charged that and that and that when I don't have that service, the answer is not okay, let's look at that again and let's rework that here. The answer is you don't want a car, leave. That is what you call an unequal negotiation.

[4:14:47 PM]

And what we are asking the council to do is create an equal negotiation, space. We're proposing two new solutions. Solution one is a standard contract. That is, every franchise has to use a contract that the city has worked on in concert with the franchises and in consultation with the drivers to put together enough protections for drivers so that if there are contract violations, et cetera, that the driver can go to court with it. Can't we build a contract that equalizes the power to a degree. That contract won't solve all the problems. That contract won't create absolute equality. We'll still be this way. But it will be better than being down here. The lease cap, as I said, the lease cap is an accepted practice and councilmember Zimmerman is right, it's a bundle of charges. What we are saying is that there has to be an ordinance that specifies and says these are the only charges that are allowed of a driver. And we are the only group that can sit and figure those charges out. I challenge Mr. Carbo to open up the books. I mean, I think we need to really look at it and say how much instability are you creating in the driver's lives when you increase fees, when you suspend them,

[4:17:11 PM]

et cetera. We create a reasonable process and we -- and where the city is at the table, the franchise at the table and the drivers are at the table, when we work out the lease and say this lease will hold for five years. This lease will hold for two years. So the driver doesn't have to worry about fact that he's paying X amount. And the driver's lives are precarious. If their expenses go up by a thousand dollars. Any questions. Does anybody have any questions? Go ahead. >> Zimmerman: I'm going to take you outside of my box. What's in the box here, and you've done a great job talking about it, is this imbalance of

power between the group of drivers and the franchise owners. Got drivers, got franchise owners. All right, here it comes. Who is the most important group that you left out. It's not us. Those people are more important than the franchise owners and the drivers as a group. And you notice how they haven't been mentioned. That's the first point.

[4:19:12 PM]

That's the first point. Second point, I'll talk about the tnc's, the companies that are -- the Uber, the Lyft are these companies that have innovated something and they're out there right now on their applications. I don't know what their doing. I don't know how their Texas model works. I don't know how the technology works. I don't know what their software systems are. The people ride, they don't have a dog in the hunt for drivers. They don't have a dog in the hunt for Uber and Lyft, the software companies. They're just trying to get from point A to point B for as little money as they're trying to pay. That's all the customers are trying to do. So that's why I wanted to take you out of this box. I'm sitting here thinking, gosh, I wish -- we have tnc's. You know what beauty of this is, we could go on to handling congestion. I have ranch road 620 that's a parking lot in the morning and evening. I want to focus on that problem because I don't know how to handle this problem here. >> I would agree with councilmember Zimmerman and say that the passenger is important. In all of my testimonies I have brought the passenger into the center of my discussion because while we're saying that everybody is not equal, the passenger is more equal than others, but the relationship is where passengers and drivers are together inside one car

[4:21:15 PM]

for specified periods of time when they do the dropoff. So at least at the level of safety, of passenger safety, the driver safety, driver safety is the passenger safety. And in that they are more equal than the franchises. The franchises don't care if they pick up 25 a day or 25,000 a day. They've got their money and laughing all the way to the bank. As a driver -- >> Kitchen: Wait a minute. Let's all be respectful of each other here. >> That's fine. All I'm saying is that I want to put the driver and the passenger together as people who care about each other. That is the nature of the business. That is the nature of the relationship. If you look at the number of taxi drivers in Austin who have what are called specials, drivers, passengers or repeat customers, that's a huge number. That's how most of them survive. That wouldn't happen if passengers are not happy with the drivers. Now, when it comes to tnc's, I'll say this much. I think the lease cap is important on a health and safety ground. That is the higher the lease the more tension that a driver has in driving. The more unsafe, more an more tense and that means more unsafe passenger situations. So I think we can look at lease caps and a health and safety concern. Now coming to-'s, let me -- tnc's, let me give you two figures. In the month of December 2014, which is the last figure released from Austin, they have a 250 odd thousand taxi rides and about 130 tnc rides. So tnc's are way below because they're still not able to track enough drivers is what I'm hearing. I spoke to a tnc driver yesterday who is desperate to come back to taxis, but he cannot come back to taxis because he's locked in with a car. He thought it would be

[4:23:15 PM]

better in tnc's than in taxis and that's why he went there and now I'm suffering there. Now he has 100,000 miles on his car in less than one year and that's -- and he's struggling there. But we are not bringing up tnc's, only for one reason. Because we know Austin is under a pilot program and the pilot program runs out in October and we are being helpful and want to bring that issue up only at that time.

>> Kitchen: Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Our next speaker is Mr. [Indiscernible] And after him will be Jennifer Mcphail. >> Hello, everybody. My name is [indiscernible] With adapt of Texas. I have a few points. First, it's very interesting with councilmember Zimmerman bringing up the passengers. And thank you for that. Because I as a person with a disability want to be a passenger, and currently cannot get a cab. Several times I've been waiting for cabs and we know this issue, we've talked about it several times. I don't think adding more permits will help the issue. I think we need to work on it. I think adding the gps tracking is a big step and also finding ways to --

[4:25:19 PM]

we've given the cab companies [indiscernible] We have to give them a stake. We have to hold them to a standard where they understand that my money, that people with disabilities money is as valued, as valued and as important as everybody else's money. And we do not want to be separate -- we do not want a separate cab company to specialize in service for people with disabilities because separate is not equal. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Do you have any questions? Okay. Thank you. Yes. >> I do have a question, thank you. Can you help me understand, I know capital metro provides services. >> Yes. >> Could you help me understand what services they provide and what services they don't provide that would force you to use a taxi? >> They provide a fixed route service and they provide also a limited service to -- specialized service that you have to sign up for and qualify for, for metro access. And it would force me to use a taxi. Let's say I'm here until 4:00 in the morning, which is common, and buses stop running, so I would want to get a taxi to be able to go home safely. Worse is an interesting word. It's not about what would force me to use a taxi, it's about choice. >> Kitchen: I apologize. That wasn't a good word for me to use. >> It is about choice and it is about equality. Thank you. And we've been dealing with this issue for 25 years and it's time that we don't have to worry about whether -- if I pick up my cell phone or if there's an app on my cell phone, whether I get a cab or not.

[4:27:20 PM]

It should be a no brainer to me just as it is a no brainer to the rest of you. >> So is the -- the metro access program that's available, is that -- >> During the hours that the regular fixed route buses work. It also depends on how close the person is, how close they live to a bus stop. It needs to be, I believe, three-quarters of a mile from a regular bus stop. >> Okay. And then there was another question. Is it just available to go to certain like medical appointments or can you schedule -- do you have to schedule it ahead of time? >> Do you have to schedule it ahead of time. You also have to be approved and they're being very stringent on their approval process. I don't really want to focus on metro access because what we want is a regular integrated is system, whether that be with taxi cabs and Uber and Lyft or some combination thereof, and buses. We want to be able to travel, you know, as easily as everybody else. >> Kitchen: Right. I was just wondering as an integrated opportunity of it what capital metro offers to supplement what the taxi offers, what I was trying to understand. So thank you. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Jennifer Mcphail. >> My name is Jennifer Mcphail also with adapt of Texas. Let me be clear for you. I'm not eligible for paratransit services from capital metro. Simply being in a wheelchair does not make you eligible. You have to be eligible if you're incapable of using

[4:29:21 PM]

the bus system as it is. We fought a lot of years in adapt to make capital metro accessible, so we want to extend that same service, that same technique over to taxicabs because people just want to pay a fee for a service and go wherever they want to go. Flexibility and spontaneity is what access is all about. You

may not necessarily want to take capital metro to go on a date or to get to a wedding or to go to a funeral. Sometimes you just want to get there quickly. If my mom gets sick, she has disabilities of her own and she's a continuous oxygen. Buses may not be available to me when something happens in a crisis. We're talking about giving the people the ability to go to locations where buses don't go. There's not always a bus stop everywhere you want to go. There are people that ride the walk along the shoulder of I-35 and things like that trying to get to doctors. We want to move away from that. They say that taxi cab drivers and the companies say that they want to provide a service to the community, but for over 20 years we've listened to excuses about why they can't. I want to tell you that the provisions that have been proposed today aren't necessarily going to be enough to actually meet the demand for people that want to use the service. In 9-11 in Las Vegas, my mom got me -- I think that year I turned 30 so she got me a trip to Las Vegas. I went and had a good time and it was great, a lot of fun, but then we got trapped

[4:31:22 PM]

because there were no flights in or out. And this crisis nationally. No one could go anywhere easily. And here we are in a city that we are in a city that's in panic. We were trying to figure out how to get to the airport. I was able to get a taxi in the middle of all that [inaudible]. Sunday night to go to bd Riley's to listen to Irish folk music. No one can explain that to me. I'm not rich enough to deal with every cost they're ever going to have. Another thing is the gps system would go a long way. I don't understand why an entire industry of people is allowed to say that because I'm a disabled person that they're not going to pick me up. It's not okay. Wife given them enough incentives. Now we need to give them an incentive that is enforcement. >> I want to say thank you for helping me increase the learning and knowledge about all the problems and issues and the options that people have. And as everyone knows, we're kind of still under a learning curve here. >> Yes, ma'am, absolutely. >> Kitchen: Thank you for being really -- >> And thank you for being really clear with the issues

[4:33:23 PM]

and problems of using the bus system and why alternate transportation is needed and it needs to be a choice. Thank you. >> I'm a consumer. I want to consume their product, that's all. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Let me run over again and see if this makes sense to you. You had mentioned concerns that maybe what we're doing is not enough. So what we've got in front of us so far anyway is the requirements relating to the taxi cab fleet that is accessible, and that's that 10%. We've also got requirements related to response, that the average response time be seven minutes of the standard. >> Yes, ma'am. I would love it if that actually happened, but as long as they're able to say that's an A.D.A. Call, I don't want to pick it up, I don't see that working. >> Okay. So what you're saying is that these standards are good standards, but unless they're held to them or unless they have to take the call -- that's the problem. There's a provision that we're adding that says while in service the taxi cab driver should receive requests from the terminal when the cab is determined by the global positioning service to be the closest taxi cab to the pickup location. Is that getting closer to what you're thinking? >> It's closer. In the beginning when adapt was protesting and putting our bodies in front of the buses in order to get [inaudible], this is never going to work. There will never be a demand that could actually justify putting a lift on every because. What we found is thousands upon thousands of people ride the bus every month. And it's not the same 10 people doing it. If it's thousands and thousands of rides every month, that means that there's a huge demand for

[4:35:28 PM]

it, and I assume that will is what will happen with taxis as well. Once people realize it's a reliable service and they'll pick up up, they will use it and people will be pleasantly surprised and probably overwhelmed with the demand. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. David Witte is next. >> Good day. My name is David Witte with adapt of Texas. I feel like I should start by saying do you have any questions? The material that's been covered covers it pretty well. >> Kitchen: I would pose the same question to you also. What is your thought on the sort of package of changes that we're proposing here. Whether you think we're going to get -- if we're getting close enough or if we're getting there in terms of making some real changes. >> I have looked at these in detail. I've been looking at many of these in different versions for a couple of years now as part of the taxi cab taskforce. In the past 20 years I can recall three instances where the wheelchair number of permits were first introduced and then it increased from three percent to six percent and then up to six and a half percent. And with each increase of the wheelchair permits above and beyond the formularies formularies allowance, the number of times that I was able to successfully call and receive cab service, it never really increased. It still remains at one out of five calls roughly. And that's not just for me. It's the anecdotal information that the cab companies shared with us, that they've turned down or do not service about one out

[4:37:30 PM]

of five calls. They say that there are people in the community who are not -- that are not disabled. They are also not receiving cab services. Then I have to wonder why our Numbers of non-service or nonperformance and the like are four times the average of the rest of the community. I have hopes for increasing the number of permits. I'm not sure that alone will be entirely successful. I also have concerns about, well, I understand that you have to have monthly averages as Gordon was explaining earlier. We had discussions about how would you measure the response times within seven minutes of the average response times of others. And you can't really measure the average until the end of the month when you crunch the Numbers. So those have to be recorded over, you know, a series of times. Obviously you will have to change the number if you will have more than 33 cabs with wheelchair permits you will have to have smaller division of that aggregate, so less than three percent is certainly fine. That -- go ahead and work -- as Jennifer alluded to and what Jennifer actually mentioned is that we really don't see any consequences for non-achievement or nonperformance. We have seen in the past that all of these problems, and even said today that we'll have an opportunity to evaluate performance at the next franchise renewal time and that will be one of the criteria, the A.D.A. Performance will be one of the criteria that will be considered when it's time to renew franchises. But we don't see any enforcement other than that. We don't see any enforcement of the non-discrimination clauses that are contained within the transportation code, the taxi cab drivers should not discriminate because of race, age, gender or even disability.

[4:39:30 PM]

It says that in the code. I do share councilmember Zimmerman's confusion sometimes, maybe I'm paraphrasing, but my lack of understanding in how the actual taxi cab business works is profound because for me as a consumer, as a customer, I'm supposed to pick up a phone, make a call, get a cab. It's a pretty simple formula for me. It doesn't work most of the time. Thanks. >> Kitchen: Let me ask you this then. One of the provisions is that to put some requirements here for a franchise holder to qualify for special franchise permits. And that relates to the seven minutes and the three percent that we were talking about earlier. But there was also language in here that directs the staff, the department to develop penalties for franchise holders who fail to perform this standard. Does that help do you think?

>> I don't know what those penalties would be. I've heard in the past decades ago I've heard that wheelchair permits that are not utilized to the standards that were in place at the time would be reallocated to another cab company. That never happened. I've been told that drivers would be let go, cab management have told me that drivers would not be eligible to drive those particular cabs anymore. That never seemed to increase the levels of service for me at least. And I do share enthusiasm for the gps part of the ordinance. That would be a great way to help everyone in the city of Austin receive better cab service, I believe, that the nearest cab has determined by gps would be held accountable and responsible for responding. >> Kitchen: So if I'm hearing you correctly, I'm just trying to get at -- there's no point in us putting a lot of requirements in here that we don't think are going to be helpful. So I'm hearing what you're saying. I'm trying to get to a point where we have some requirements that we feel

[4:41:31 PM]

like will result in some increased access, you know. >> The overall message that we're trying to relay is that taxicabs should provide equivalent service for all of Austin citizens. And any amendments to the code, whether today or in the next week or next year, the further that goal would help us achieve our goals. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? Yes. >> Zimmerman: Just quickly, the common sense thing on this is the way markets generally work is you [inaudible] Are in business to make profits. Kind of like when we go out and get a job we trade our time and labor for profit, for money. The key to making that work is to figure out how to make it profitable for people to be on a beeline to get to you as fast as they can, pick you up and give you a ride because they're going to make money. That's really the key to kind of making it work in my book. Not passing mandates and coming up with metrics, figure out how to make it profitable and it will work. >> I share your economic views that profit is driving all of us. I'm sorry that we are becoming in the middle of a management-labor dispute, it seems, but we're not trying to do that. What we're trying to do is give cab drivers our money. And in addition to the economics, it's still attempting to overcome. >> Zimmerman: If you pay me money I'll give you a ride. >> If you're a tnc driver I might accept that. >> Kitchen: Okay. Let's see. I think I skipped over two people and I apologize for that. Is Solomon hajs here now?

[4:43:33 PM]

>> Solomon casa with lone star cab company. Good afternoon, councilmembers. I am speaking in support of franchise renewal. I would like to be short and brief since we are presented our request in the previous meetings. Again I am requesting your recommendation to the full council. First renewal of our franchise for longer term, no less than five years. I have pointed out the importance of having long-term especially for smaller companies as I rely on borrowing and financial institutions prefer when you have longer terms. Secondly, lone star cab is a company with only 108 fleet. We have challenges to improve our response time to the citywide [indiscernible] Compared to the companies that are twice, up to four times our size. We are losing the market share everyday, especially after the tnc's start operating. The only way to grow and improve service to the community is by getting additional permit and I'm asking your recommendation. I support the changes and the new recommendation in the code, including performance measure for adding new permits. In the meantime I would like to express my concerns that the measures -- what the measures look like. Since all the three companies don't have the same number of fleets. I hope the measures that will be approved by the council will take into consideration in bringing smaller companies to a fair playing field. Lastly, I am in support of improving service for the wheelchair passengers. In the meantime the proposed 10 percent would put a heavy burden on smaller companies like lone star. Currently we are five wheelchair vehicles, and if this proposal passes we have to add additional 10 more

[4:45:35 PM]

vehicles. That's 35,000, close to 350,000. So getting that funding is really a burden on us. I may ask if we can do over the period of the franchise to get that 10 percent. That would eliminate a burden on smaller companies. Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Any questions? Okay. Our last speaker is Joanabela. Is she here? >> Yes. Good afternoon. I'm Joanabela from [indiscernible] Cab company. I'm just going to go through some of the issues. I agree with Mr. Solomon that there should be a time frame over which we can come up with 10 percent of our fleet being wheelchair accessible. That is a huge amount of money that we would have to invest. Nonperformance is another issue. Nonperformance is a matter of the taxi franchises and the drivers. When we talk about picking up wheelchair passengers, I believe Mr. Carbo mentioned this briefly, but it's not that we are not doing our work, it's that we are begging our drivers with wheelchair vans to do this

[4:47:36 PM]

work. Hopefully the new measures will take care of that, but, you know, it seems like we are being criticized by the drivers for some of the things the drivers have failed to do. Another issue is that the drivers are independent contractors and if you look at the I.R.S. Code you will see that we can't really force them or tell them what to do. And the city -- the city staff often sort of say oh, these taxi franchises seem to go on and on about this independent contractor stuff. Well, this is for real. Independent contractors are supposed to be just that, independent. Now, as far as the due process is concerned, the due process, we would have to step gingerly over this because, as has been pointed out already, right now the buck stops with us for accidents and for a lot of other stuff. So if the city gets involved in the due process, that would make the city perhaps responsible for some of the issues that they negotiated for us. Perhaps an independent ombudsman type of -- I'm thinking of a university. Someone who is totally independent of the city and of the franchises and of the drivers could be a sort of mediator. In terms of lease caps, I don't think there's a complete understanding that some of the franchises have franchises within franchises or sort of companies -- may

[4:49:37 PM]

I continue? >> Kitchen: If you can finish up quickly. Issues sometimes the problem is that the lease driver who is really bright can have drivers under him. So it's like a mini franchise within our franchises. So this person can often -- because of his own -- his own financial obligations to pay off the car that he owns, but has a lease driver driving for him, he might find that he's charging what we and the drivers might consider to be too much. And I don't know if there's a mechanism to cap that. But I do know that in terms of terminal fees and some of the fees, we have companies that have different caps or different heights, so just to say well, we're going to stop this right here, you cannot move up, is not fair to the companies that during the whole recession never raised the lease or fees for the drivers like our company. >> Kitchen: Okay. If you could -- if you could wrap up, please. >> Yes. I'm just saying -- this is very important -- when you talk about lease caps, you're not talking about only the franchises, you're talking about the owner-operators who lease drivers -- who have lease drivers under them. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. >> I think that requires more study. >> Kitchen: Thank

[4:51:44 PM]

can. >> Can I speak -- I'm a driver. >> Kitchen: We've had -- we have had -- no, I'm sorry. We have had

plenty of -- we've had lots of testimony over the last couple of sessions, and we've had testimony, equal testimony from drivers and from taxicab companies, so that's all the testimony we're going to take right now. So okay. Do we have anything that the staff would like to let us know? >> Excuse me. I have to tell you the cab companies have disputed that there have never been any drivers fired wrongfully. I have to argue that that should be heard and that is why they're asking for due process. I was fired -- >> Kitchen: Mr. . >> [Indiscernible]. Yet you have no process in place. And then Mr. Zimmerman, you want to argue for free enterprise, but you want to give the franchises the right to do whatever they want. >> Kitchen: Mr. Iley, thank you very much. We would be happy to talk with you privately. >> ... They have made this argument that they have been harassed, fired for no reason. I would ask Joan Cabela, that lady knows, I was fired because I was hit by people who left the scene of an accident. [Applause]. I was not at fault. That man right there also knows it. >> Kitchen: Thank you, Mr. Iley. >> Kitchen: I was asking your staff would any of you like to make any comments. >>

[4:53:45 PM]

>> Kitchen: So let's move forward. We have before us several proposals. Do -- does anyone want to make a motion? Councilmember Tovo, could we deal with this first and then if you would like to explain what you passed out? >> Tovo: Sure. And chair, I may or may not be able to stay for the full discussion but I did want to distribute it just out of respect for the request that amendments that are going to be brought before the full council be brought before this committee first. If I'm not able to purchase in the full discussion, we can talk about it tomorrow. But these are just general bullet points. >> Kitchen: If you will like to go over them for us. >> Tovo: I'm happy to stay for as long as I can. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Thank you, councilmember Kitchen. I do have some disagreement with a number of the items here, but I think for purposes of discussion, I think this is all -- these are all rational points that the full council is going to need to deliberate on. So I'd like to go ahead and make a motion that we recommend everything you have here -- send it to full committee without a recommendation for or against. >> Kitchen: Okay. So your motion is that we move this forward to -- timid Zimmerman to the full council. >> Kitchen: Without a recommendation. >> Zimmerman: Without a recommendation. >> Kitchen: Do we have a second for that? Councilmember Zimmerman, I would be looking for a recommendation as to parts at least. I know you don't want to pull it apart, but if it's possible to provide some level of thinking to the full council that might be helpful to them. Do you think that would be possible? >> Zimmerman: Okay. If there's no second I'll just withdraw the motion and let somebody else make a motion. If there's no second. >> I'll make a motion to forward it to the council with a recommendation with what's been presented. >> Kitchen: Okay.

[4:55:47 PM]

>> Kitchen: Is there a second for purposes of discussion? I'll second for purposes of discussion. Go ahead. >> Gallo: So the reason that I wish to move this forward for discussion at the council meeting tomorrow is just to talk a little bit about business models and how businesses relate to their employees or their contractors that work with them. My background is real estate. It's actually cab driver and taxi cab situations because real estate agents are required to get a license. One of the things that I'm supporting in this is that the chauffeur's license will actually be held by the drivers so they actually have control with who they work for, and I think that's important. That's very similar in real estate. You actually hold your own license and you can interview companies and determine the company that you want to affiliate yourself with, the company that provides the best working environment for you and the type of customer service that you want to give to the customers, which is the group that we always need to think about. So I am very supportive of the chauffeur's license being held by the drivers to give

drivers the flexibility to move from company to company if they choose to do so. I think what that does in the work environment and in the business environment is that it encourages companies to provide the best benefits and the best opportunities for their drivers so that they can attract the best drivers to work for their companies because now the drivers have flexibility. [Applause]. And I think that's really important so I think opening that up will allow companies to begin to change their -- possibly, if they want to, change their company business models so that they begin to provide us a type of company environment that's attractive to those good drivers. And so that those drivers will want to work with them and be affiliated with them. The other thing I'm supporting is the removal of

[4:57:47 PM]

the caps. And the reason that I support that is that I think it would be a really unfortunate situation if we saw that one of the franchise companies started to provide that business model and provide those services and benefits and working environment that the drivers wanted to be a part of. And because of the cap limit, the drivers would not be able to work for that company. So that's my reason for removing the caps is that I want the drivers to be able to have the choice of who they want to work for. [Applause]. And I don't want them to be limited on being able to move to a different company because the company is limited by the number of permits that they have. So once again, I think what we're all trying to do is to provide an environment that works both for the companies and encourages them to build good business models and build companies that take care of the drivers and because the drivers are taken care of they're going to take care of the customers and I think we all support that. So I think we're all looking for the same thing, which is for the best service for our customers, but we also want to make sure that we have companies and the drivers that are working together to be able to do that. [Applause]. >> Kitchen: And I would simply comment that I would like to move forward this set of -- this set of proposals with a recommendation with the caveat that what I'm hearing today is that the requirement for 10% either could -- may not be effective, you know. So I think I heard that from adapt, and so I'm wanting to think about that and tomorrow when we talk about that in the full council, I may want to propose some changes to that 10% requirement. And then also the three percent will not work as

[4:59:47 PM]

three percent, I would like courages I'd like to support moving this forward with a recommendation from the committee. I know -- I understand councilmember Zimmerman, that you may have some concerns. Could we move this forward with a recommendation and note the concerns that you have? Would that work for you. >> Zimmerman: Well, I think it would be fair. I have the concerns you reflected plus some others. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Zimmerman: But I don't have a problem with it moving forward on a vote of 2-to-1. I'm going to vote against because of my concerns but I'd be happy to see it move forward with the 2-to-1 vote. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Zimmerman: I'll just be voting against. We'll have to do it again with the full council. >> Kitchen: I'll take a vote moving it forward with the recommendations. All in favor, please raise your hands. And oppose? Now, particular, you passed out -- councilmember tovo, you passed out language that relate to the due process and the lease fees. Would you like to go over those. >> Tovo: I would appreciate that opportunity and I think we have another have copy among the staff that we can put up on the board if I could ask for one back. I should have hung on to a copy. Sorry about that. And this is -- we have some more specific language that would support this but it has not yet been vetted by our legal counsel and so these are the general amendments that I would propose. Under due process, and having heard the requests that there be be -- that this -- that there be more discussion around and more specifics around due process, this would require the city manager to

draft a model contract after a stakeholder process that includes the drivers and the franchises. And that would tackle the main issue we heard with regard to due process. It would spell out the instances

[5:01:50 PM]

that would lead to suspension or termination so it's very clear and that there's not uncertainty about what those are. The second would identify an independent arbiter to hear those concerns and I believe - that I believe would be the best path forward. Rather than ask the city to adjudicate those for relying on the existing system. Those model contract would say come back to council for approval on -- no later than August 4th and I'll address that in a little bit and because I think ultimately it would be best if we could really nail down all of these pieces before we vote on the ordinance and the franchise agreements. Clearly we don't have the time possible before tomorrow to nail down all of those detail so what we're -- what I'm hoping is that we can pass those tomorrow, but have provisions in there that allow certain pieces that need more succession and more time to come back to -- discussion and time to come back to council. And the last bullet point, number four, allows the franchise if they want to propose something different than that model contract they can serge propose their own as an alternative compliance equivalent. Lease fees. This involves stakeholder conversation and we'll look at franchise information and take into serious account the fees they believe are necessary to operate their modeled in a financially sustainable way and address the taxi drivers concerns that those need to be consistent so thing budget as well. And I think this is a provision that the taxi drivers association recommended as well. It would also create a process where those fees would be assessed on an annual basis to account for increases in capital

[5:03:53 PM]

expenditures or other things that would justify an increase to that fee structure. [Applause] And that, too, would come back -- that too would come back to council for final approval before August 4th. And I think that covers the two -- the two issues. There may be some concerns, well, if before August 4th, there's still are concerns, that the franchises have about those -- about the fee structure, or about that model contract, what are the options then? We've already voted. After tomorrow on those contracts. So what would be the provisions and I would ask staff's help in thinking this through, but my proposal would be that the existing contract be extended automatically for an additional 60 days to allow an additional period of time to work out the lease -- the lease fee and the due process. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Thank you, mayor pro tem. [Applause] You've got on paper kind of what I was asking Mr. Passmore for. You started to get that on paper. Good job -- >> Tovo: Let me say that he started the conversation. >> Zimmerman: Good. >> Tovo: We responded to the information they forwarded does. >> Even better. Down on the bottom about the part about the continued conversation, I think we talked about this a month or so ago, this was a calendar we had to have and had to have a third reading done this I guess, is that right? >> Zimmerman: Yeah, that would be tomorrow. And would you anticipate maybe a motion that would -- see, I thought the reason we had put an one-year extension was so we could consider things like what you put continue here. Instead of 60 days, I think it would take 12 months to get

[5:05:53 PM]

something like this worked out. So -- I guess -- well, I guess -- yeah, this goes back to the one-month time period. I thought things like this would be what we would work on with the one-year extension. >> Kitchen: My comment would be that I think we need to find a way to provide some certainty in the

franchise agreement process and that's why I proposed the five years. And I would be very reluctant to extend for 60 days or simply a year. So that would be my comment. So -- did -- did you want to -- >> Tovo: To be very clear. I was definitely not proposing we extend the current contract just 60 days. That we vote tomorrow. But that it include a provision that when those model -- if this is [no audio] When it comes back to council in the fee structure, if those are not acceptable to the franchise -- to our franchises, but they have an opportunity to extend their contracts, the ones they have that are expiring in August for an additional two months to allow for additional back and forth. >> Kitchen: I see, if I'm hearing you correctly, you're not suggesting that our vote tomorrow on third -- those be limited to 60 days, you would put a term on those. >> Tovo: Absolutely. >> Kitchen: I'm suggesting pie years. You would put a -- you're building in a caveat, a way to deal with the situation where -- where -- let's see. If -- where there was not agreement reached by August. >> Tovo: That's exactly right. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Did new any further

[5:07:54 PM]

questions? >> Zimmerman: Maybe a point of clarity. I guess we've heard from both sides and it's a pretty passionate issue and I'm just not convinced we'll be able to figure out complex stuff like -- if we decide to -- these are serious issues if, the city manager's going to draft up something that puts the council or some of our city staff into a due process model and we have to get an arbitrator. It seems it involves us in the labor-management relationship that you can see is pretty contentious. I don't see that's possible in a matter of a few months. But it is what it is. Thank you for bringing that up. >> Kitchen: I appreciate you bringing this forward for us to talk about. Did anyone have any further questions about it? Anyone else you would like us to address with this? >> Tovo: I think that's it. If you have suggestions or ideas to offer, I understand the point you're raising, councilmember Zimmerman, it's challenging but I'm also not keen to locking in contracts for a period of five years that don't address these important issues and I will say, and I really -- because we've been working on this, very recently, I also haven't heard from the franchises how they would respond to some of these issues and, of course, you spoke to them in your comments today but I would welcome more specific feedback between now and tomorrow. >> Kitchen: I would propose as a committee we don't take any action on these suggestions that you will be bringing up tomorrow and time between now and tomorrow to have further conversations about them. So -- thank you very much. [Applause] >> Tovo: Okay. >> Kitchen: I also just want to circle back around and clarify on our previous motion that that includes -- I don't want it to end up in the minutes or to be misunderstanding that it only

[5:09:55 PM]

includes the first page. It also includes part 10 which is in the follow-up -- is in the attachment, taxicab driver shall accept -- when the driver's taxicab is determined by the global positioning service to be the closest. That's a part of this too. To make this easier for everyone to understand what was voted on and moving forward to council, is not the summary sheet, it's the actual draft ordinance. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And the actual draft franchise ordinances as well. So that's what is going to be reflected in the minutes. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Thank you. Are we ready to move on from this item or -- do you have anything further, councilmember Gallo? I want to thank everyone forever being here today. And I want to thank you for your patient throughout the last couple months and I want to explain again, tomorrow -- I may not have mentioned this before, but we have requested this item come up at a time certain tomorrow. And in that suggestion is 4:00 tomorrow. So we have asked this be set on the council agenda for 4:00 tomorrow and we'll also have testimony tomorrow. And as with our previous council meeting, that testimony will be eight speakers at two minutes each. So the full council will be discussing

these issues tomorrow and we appreciate you coming today to give us more time to hear from you and talk through these issues. Thank you very much. [Applause] Okay, so our next item on the agenda is -- where is my list?

[5:11:59 PM]

Yes, item 3. We're going to go back to item three. >> Ms. Kitchen, I have an overhead of the neenah road project. A little map. If we can get that on the overhead. Do we have an presentation in staff on item number three? >> Short. >> Kitchen: Short? Okay. As soon as the room clears, we'll start with that. >> Kitchen: Okay, you want to go ahead? Thank you. >> Good afternoon, my name is David, the city engineer with the public works department. Streets and bridges. What you have before you is the powerpoint presentation regarding the neenah street widening project. The city of Austin received a request from Williamson county to widen the avenue. Under statute, there's an interpret interpret that contractually -- there's an interlocal agreement agreement that combines it with Williamson county. All costs related to the design, and inspection and management will be borne by Williamson county. Plans will be submitted for the city of Austin for approval and

[5:14:00 PM]

the construction, the project is within the "Austin city limits" specifically within district 6. After the proposed improvements are accepted by the city, we'll accept the operation and maintenance and repair costs associated with the project. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> The interlocal agreement, again, is a mechanism by which we bind ourselves with the means of doing the project between the city and Williamson county. It reads as -- it requires city council approval. The project resides within the city of Austin city limits and this is apparently a routine way of waiving fees for projects taken by the government, city of Austin. The project scope, basically neenah is a two-lane roadway, approximately 40 feet wide with bike lean lanes and a five foot sidewalk along the north side of the root road and due to increased traffic volume it's proposed to be widen to 51 feet, accommodating -- two eight foot shared use paths one on the north side of the road and one on the south side. The schedule itself is to be determined. This is basically project location map. Just north of the toll road 45 and east of Parma lane. >> Kitchen: Can you back up and let me look that the again. >> The map? >> Kitchen: Yeah, the map. The proposal is to widen the stretch in the circle?

[5:16:01 PM]

>> No, from only I hill to about 1500 feet east of sew lair adrive. The terminus point. Solera drive. This is another representation of the limits to be construction. >> Kitchen: I see it now. >> And the fees that are under consideration to be waived. About \$4,100. >> Gallo: I have a question about the fees. One of the things that I council has been sensitive to to that will be topic for future discussions are fee waivers and you made a comment this is typically done for this type of project with fee waivers or just something that we're volunteering do or required to do? I'm trying to understand as we -- we determine fee waiver policy, where this fits in. >> Councilmember, in the past, these types of projects were an another governmental agency borne the cost of designing construction. Council has routinely waived these fees. You're not compelled to do that, just something that's been done. >> Gallo: And who owns the road? >> The road with within the city limits of Austin, a city roadway. >> Gallo: We're responsible for the maintenance in the future. >> We would. We maintain our roads generally on a 10-year basis where we do some sort of preventive maintenance to preserve the life for an extended period of time. It's not an large cost and gets incorporate flood the annual operating budget. >> Gallo: So actually, of course, I'm

hearing all of this correctly, Williamson county is actually participating in a road that we own and we maintain. >> That's correct. >> Gallo: So probably a good thing for us. >> It's --

[5:18:03 PM]

>> Kitchen: They're offering to help pay for a road that we own. >> Gallo: So never mind about the fee waiver question. [Laughter] >> The estimation is between \$2.5 million and \$3 million. It's a pretty good return on investment. >> Gallo: We would appreciate gifts from anyone like that. >> Kitchen: Do we want to keep moving? >> That's the end. >> Kitchen: Did you want to share anything, councilmember Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: I'd like to make a motion that we approve -- or send this to full council with the recommendation for a passage. If I would make that motion. >> Kitchen: A second. >> Gallo: Second. >> Zimmerman: And I did visit with commissioner Berkman in Williamson county, maybe -- gosh, it's probably been two and a half or three months ago, and it's kind of moved slowly, part of this is we're new to this. I didn't know how these things worked but it's been quite a few months in the making so I appreciate the chance to get it before the committee and again, I would expect this would come before the full council and people would have questions and similar to what you did. And I'm also curious how the mobility committee might be able to work with Williamson and maybe even Hays county, to figure out how to pool resources. And maybe join forces on doing road expansion projects. Such as a policy. >> Gallo: That brings up a good question. How do we do that? How do we reach out to other entities to start that conversation? I mean, one of the -- I think about the springs between Loop 360 going west, and I always thought that was the city of Austin road but it's actually owned by the county. How does that conversation begin and how can we encourage that conversation? >> So councilmember, I'm Robert

[5:20:05 PM]

Spillar, director of the transportation department and where the dividing line between public works and transportation, typically, where it's new capacity or expanded capacity, typically, it's the transportation department gets involved. What's interesting is, of course, in -- I don't want to be disrespectful, the city's within the county, but not always the county within with the city. So -- where a project falls within the city limits it's generally easy to establish a joint nexus between partnerships for a partnership between the cities and counties to jointly fund or participate in a project, so here in central Texas or central Travis county, you see at Y, which is within the city limits or right on the edge of the city limits, you see a three-way partnership between TxDOT, Travis county and the city. Similarly, in Williamson county they're more proactive because that's where a lot of the subdivisions are happening, coming to us and I see on the map you put up, there's an extension, I believe as part of this project to connect this project through. So it's not just a widening. But they actually came to us and said, hey, we'd like to partner because we have joint constituents in the area that need this kind of an improvement. So typically, talking about partnerships when we work on projects, we look around to see who would be the interested parties that would benefit and you see the city participate with the state on projects on state roadways where it makes sense and similarly with the county, here in Travis county, Williamson and Hays county, to a lesser extent, Hays, because our city limits nudge into Hays county on the south end. It's hard, I think, for the city to invest outside of our city limits, it's done in the extra territorial jurisdiction where there's a joint nexus, once you step outside of the city limits,

[5:22:07 PM]

it's hard to establish a nexus for the city to invest in the county afterwards. So if that makes sense. >>

Gallo: So if you -- if we do this, is there a priority at which we begin to ask for the cooperation with other entities? So if you have a road that's in -- >> Well, we walk hat in hand asking for money from our partners. >> Gallo: I'd love to ask for money for this. >> This is one where they came to us. In past bond programs we specifically put money aside for partnerships, quote/unquote partnerships. You know, partners usually come to the table when we have some money to put into the partnership ourselves and so that has attracted positive investments on project, where -- I-35 is a good example, one bond program we appropriated about a million dollars to start the design process and get a discussion. Last I heard, txdot put \$40 million into the design and I think we're headed toward a construction project in the region that could be large and as early as the next couple of years, moving toward a major reconstruction in about five years. Partnerships work well and as you said, we are always on the lookout. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Kitchen: Let me ask a question. Can you put the map back up? So did I hear correctly, this is -- it's an extension as well as a widening? >> No, ma'am. It's not an extension, it's basically a widening of project of the roadway. We're adding 10 feet to the south side of the road. >> Kitchen: Okay, so this map with the dotted lines is not what we're doing here. Right? >> There's a future plan to make the connection because what happens right now in neenah, you have a couple of schools, and there's also I think a private catholic school.

[5:24:07 PM]

Three schools and we have a problem of one access, right? One entry and one exit. So there's a future man to try to get this connected so you could not just go through farmer, but also get to Pierson ranch and eventually be able to go interest there down to sh 45, because right now, it only goes up to Avery ranch to the north. >> Councilmember, chair, if I could correct myself, I probably introduced confusion saying it was both the extension as well as the widening. >> I have talked to -- in indication, Williamson county and they're working on plans and we expect them to come to us with a proposal for the extension. >> Kitchen: But that's a different agreement. >> It would be a different agreement and I'm sorry I added that confusion. >> Kitchen: Help understand the reason for the widening. Does it work without -- >> It's to match the existing conditions to the west of neenah avenue and then continues to the east there where it terminates, we're basically having that same cross-section that will ultimately meet whatever the extension requirements will be. >> Kitchen: Okay, and what -- one last question: What's in the land that is not -- I know the extension is later but I'm curious what's here? Now? >> Undeveloped. >> Kitchen: It's undeveloped land? Okay. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Any other questions, comments? Okay -- one last question. Is this on the council agenda yet? >> For tomorrow. >> Kitchen: Oh, it is tomorrow. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: All right, we've got a motion. Do we have a motion? Okay, to send it forward. Yeah. All in favor, please raise your hands. Oppose? So our next item is item -- yeah.

[5:26:09 PM]

Let's go to item number nine. >> Excuse me, madame chair, sorry. >> I think we have to vote on -- >> [Inaudible] >> Kitchen: Yeah, we voted it on it unanimously. >> Never mind. >> Kitchen: Let me ask, we have three items left. Nine, 10 and 11, I think we'll postpone item eight until August and we have about half an hour. So do you all think that we can cover nine, 10 and 11 -- I don't know how much time you need from a staff presentation perspective. Or do we need -- yeah, it depends on us, that's what he's going to say. Depends on us. We could take them out of order if we want to -- >> We could probably be successful in briefing on nine. It's just a few slides, depending on how much questions you have. >> Kitchen: Okay, all of this depends on how many questions we have. Do you want to go forward with nine, then. >> Zimmerman: Yes. >> Kitchen: All right, we'll go forward with nine. Let's see. So the thinking is we can get to nine and that would be the extent of it, right, in the next half hour? >> Yes. >>

Kitchen: Yeah, my -- thank you, Howard, Mr. Lazarus, for being here. I'm very -- I'm not sure we could do it full justice. So I think we may be -- looks like we're going to have to postpone 10 and 11. Does that -- okay. We've got a meeting in the first part of August we can do that. >> Yes, ma'am, we'll be queued up to do those if it's the pleasure of the chair. >> Kitchen: Okay, all right. >> My name is Robert Spillar, director of transportation for Austin transportation

[5:28:09 PM]

department. I'm making this presentation for Robert Goode, he's in another meeting. And it's the item 9. The Papp cap metro quarter cent fund. And Mr. Lazarus is also here. What the quarter cent can be used for and what's available at the discretion of this council of the history, as you will remember back in 2000 almost a decade and a half ago, there was a light rail proposition defeated in Austin. That light rail appropriation was offered by cap metro. In 2001, capital metro agreed to share 25% of their annual revenue. And so -- or 1% and they would give a quarter of that, hence, the quarter cent money, that was previously dedicated to the light rail that failed to fund transportation projects within the city. I believe they did the same for the other member cities within the cap metro jurisdiction at the time. What that means was about \$139 million was returned to the city. Through the quarter cent funds. In 2004, a rail vote here in the region did pass and so that's the red line that now runs from downtown to [inaudible] And they had an use, a rail use for that additional quarter cent. And so they used the monies that are collected now for the service that they provide on the red line as well as other commuter transit services. Interlocal agreement between the city and capital metro related to those regional transportation

[5:30:10 PM]

funds were to use those for those types of projects and the last modification was in 2010. The categories of viable use were for regional mobility, sidewalk type projects that serving school safety. Sidewalk and bicycle projects and traffic snags and roadway intersection improvements and mobility stuff and maintenance and reconstruction and regional mobility right-of-way. All of those needed to have a nexus toward transit typically. Any new projects would have to meet one of those categories. As listed there, regional mobility, support public transit, provide leverage for federal and private funding and adds to an existing program and expedites a critical mobility project. Capital board has the right to agree to the project where the city spends those revenues, as we complete the investment of that original \$139 million. Of that original 139 plus or minus million dollars of which currently \$113 million has been spent. There's an approximate \$4.3 million already obligated or you can think of as committed to authorized work. Includes the fund that's the previous council approved for airport boulevard. For \$2 million of that \$4.3 million was the funds that were obligated toward airport boulevard. That means approximately \$21.8 million remains available to be assigned to projects or committed to projects. As part of the financial plan approved by council for the 2014 Austin strategic mobility plan that, \$21.8 million was saved for urban rail operations that

[5:32:11 PM]

we were in partnership with cap metro to deploy. Of course, the urban rail initiative did not pass the voters so we don't have a project to spend those funds on in terms of operations. And so that amount of money is available to council to redirect to existing infrastructure needs within the city. About \$21.8 million. So we were asked to provide ideas how that remaining money might be spent and we tried to stay pretty broad here. The first option that we would suggest you consider would be to split the

funding among current and future corridor development programs. Previous councils through the bond program and voters approved us developing plans for a number of corridors, we continue to do that. To be ready for funding when it becomes available. One of the things we found over the last several years, even in these tight financial situations when funds become available they typically have to be invested right away and one idea would be to invest them in projects we've already defined. >> Kitchen: A question. >> Gallo: I want to make sure I understand the scope. The amount of money that we're going to make a decision on how to spend, is the 21 -- >> Available to district. >> Gallo: When you talk about the other amounts within these categories, that's the -- >> That's the need, the total need. >> Gallo: We're only shopping with \$21.8 million. >> You're correct there garage thank you. >> Please understand within the corridors those are collections of smaller projects, even within the corridor plans we could find opportunities to invest \$10,000, \$10 million, whatever the case might be. But this is clearly one place we would suggest to go to shop and to use your words in a sense

[5:34:12 PM]

because we have avenue collection of projects within those corridors identified. >> Kitchen: Another question, the bulleted items under number one, those are -- that reflect all of the quarter plans that are finished or underway. >> Those are the ones we have completed or -- yes. Those are the ones we've completed. There are several -- I take that back. South Lamar is currently under development as is the Guadalupe west campus, but we're pretty close to finishing those up. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Currently, another suggestion would be to fund various deferred projects for railroad crossings or improvements across the city. We have an collection of about -- well, it's easy to define those projects for you and it's probably in the range of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of options there. To look at. Signals to improve traffic signal systems. A signal video where we're in the process of updates our entire signal system. We have an estimate of about a \$50 million backlog in projects that we could provide you. Bite size elements to consider buying, depending on your need. You could did add new traffic signals or pedestrian beacons, those are safety related projects and have a high nexus to transit because we know that many of our transit -- the locations where they're looking to board the bus or get off the bus and so that would be one area. You could certainly improve access to existing transit facilities and fund access Austin projects and disperse remaining fund equitably per

[5:36:12 PM]

council district. And if do you that, you talk about \$2 million per district. With the math the way it is, and so to make that \$2 million go as far as it would go, I would suggest you think about perhaps sidewalks and pedestrian improvements in each of your districts. We know that that need is dispersed pretty evenly throughout the districts in terms of ready-to-go projects and there are enough corridor projects that be could fund funded. The Brodie corridor or east-west corridorred throughout town. Without getting specific, about the projects that we would recommend at this point, if that were the pleasure of council or this committeedom back with specific -- to come back with specific projects in each strict, we could do that with the direction from the council. We did not want to -- if there's questions, both Howard and I could provide answers. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Zimmerman, do you have questions? Branch I have a question. I think one of the things that -- and it's interesting what we've become experts on. Traffic signals is one of those that I never thought I would be learning this much. But what's interesting about the traffic signals, of all the issues that the public has, affordability at the top. Traffic being a very close second and under traffic, it's the signal light synchronization that just drives people crazy. And it's interesting to kind of learn about the system and the improvements and how -- what an incredible effect that will have in a positive way on moving people down our existing streets. >> Yes,

ma'am. >> Gallo: I'm glad that's on theory. I know, don, you've been working on analysis how funds have been

[5:38:13 PM]

spent on roadways or traffic issues throughout the district. And I would be interested in knowing the lists that you have here, what districts those would be in. And so that we kind of work toward funding in an equitable way for all of the districts. >> Well, my -- thanks. My first, obviously, request would be to do the math, as director spillar said, cut that thing up in 10 pieces and give it to councilmember to see what we can accomplish and use the money on studies or for leverages with other entities like the county or even with school districts. We have an school district that's interested in contributing some money for a roadway. So I think there's a lot of creative things we could do. Probably our biggest issue -- there's a lot of big big issues -- but andersonville road. There's a hue and vie for that. And that touches Williamson county and Williamson county is favorably disposed to help. It's different, I think, for each district around the city, so I would absolutely love to get a resolution in to break that money into 10 pieces and let us work on how we can leverage it. >> Kitchen: Yeah, could we do -- from your perspective in terms of the direction we would be providing, that we go forward with a resolution that says we're going to spend \$2 million or whatever it is, per district, and that -- than would be for some broadly stated purposes without a statement of specific projects. And then our offices could work with you to identify the appropriate projects within each

[5:40:14 PM]

district. >> Uh-huh. >> Kitchen: Do you think that would work from y'all's perspective without -- >> We're certainly willing to work with council to -- to help you be successful. I would just bring the, hopefully, the obvious thing that signals come in units of a certain size. So \$2 million is going to buy you a certain number of signals, certain number of feet of sidewalks. And -- you know. In terms of roads, it's not going to buy you a lot of new roads, unfortunately, because of the cost. >> Kitchen: Right. >> But sidewalks you can get a lot more sidewalks the ground and a number of signals for \$2 million and as councilmember Zimmerman says, each council may be quite different depending on where you're at in terms of needs. >> Kitchen: Are there discreet segments of these corridor plans? >> Absolutely. Even within the corridor, the burnet corridors, one of the great need there's is sidewalk and drainage improvements and as you may know, we're pursuing with other partners a grant for money and these monies could theoretically be used for local match for grants in some of these corridors. \$2 million, I don't want to underestimate the value. It can be leveraged. It can be expanded in some quarters, so it can make a real difference in some quarters. >> Kitchen: The reason I'm asking and thinking that might be helpful in thinking in terms of district rather than a -- you know, a smaller number of larger projects is simply because -- you know, one of the things I experience and others too in talking with folks in the district, it's those local projects that we can see that will make a -- that can make a difference.

[5:42:15 PM]

And maybe it's timely for us to spend this -- these -- this fund on that kind of approach. Understanding, of course, there's a much larger projects that we've got to sink our teeth in and put larger dollars toddler. But my thought is that -- larger dollars toward but my thought, taking these funded and using them across all of the districts in a way that's specific. A resolution that specifies these will be used across the districts and for generally stated purposes without naming the specific projects, and then the determination of which projects could be done, you know, in combination of a conversation between

staff and that district -- that councilmember. Is that what you were thinking? Does that make sense to you? >> Zimmerman: I think that would be -- of course, it would be acceptable with us. That's fine. I think that would also give us a chance to work with each council district to make sure that good principles are being used. Sidewalks between schools and safe routes are -- I would argue are of higher value than some other sidewalks. Signals are appropriate in some locations and other -- other traffic devices appropriate in others and I think that would give an opportunity for each council district to get very well informed about the best besttechniques. >> Kitchen: The purpose would be to say for traffic safety and safe routes to school and safe -- >> The values. >> Kitchen: Yes, what I would be interested in stating is what

[5:44:16 PM]

those values should be so the parameters for how the dollars are used in each district would be set. So it's not an open-ended \$2 million for any purpose whatsoever. I think that would be more valuable, we would be saying we're trying to accomplish some goals. >> Right, and you I think that would be easier than keeping with the stipulation that's between cap metro and the city about the types of uses and so forth conference yeah. >> And I know you're on the capital metro board. Board. But it would make it easier for capital metro to concur with the expenditures as well. >> Kitchen: I'd like to make a motion. Ready for a motion? I would like to move that we -- let's see if I can state this. As a mobility committee, we recommend to full council and we develop a resolution, what that resolution states is that these dollars be used across each district and that we set the parameters for what they can be used for -- yeah, that they be dispersed equitably perfect council district to fund mobility, to -- to advance the purposes of -- let's see. Of -- I would set out some parameters that would include improved access to transit, improved access to schools, new traffic signals. Existing infrastructure needs. Anything else you would add? >> [Inaudible] >> Kitchen: No, it doesn't need to be complicated. But I think you understand -- >> Yes. >> Kitchen: What we're saying. >> I would suggest we look back agreement. And I would suggest traffic

[5:46:20 PM]

calming. >> Kitchen: Oh, yeah, traffic calming would be. >> [Inaudible] >> Gallo: Maybe being broad but also it would be important the tie in to working with the transportation department to determine the priorities within the district. >> And that would be the transportation and public works department. Madame chair, I understand there's citizens wanting to speak on this item. >> Kitchen: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't [inaudible] >> I don't want to throw a wrench in how you -- >> Kitchen: I completely -- I didn't realize we had some folks, and I'm looking for my list. So -- we have a motion on the floor. So I will take - - how about if I take the public testimony and then we'll vote on the motion? And I don't seem to have a list. So -- how many speakers do we have? So we have four? Five? >> The list may be on the same list as the taxi speakers, I'm told. >> Kitchen: Well, okay, I found it. All right, our first speaker is Christopher Stanton. >> Good afternoon, council and thank you for your time. I'm Christopher Stanton, the chair of the bicycle advisory council for the city of Austin. We oversee everything that has

[5:48:21 PM]

to do with bicycling from a community standpoint so we review staff plans, we provide feedback to staff for designs and also we have a pretty tight coupling with the pedestrian advisory council as well because almost all facilities dealing with bicycling also benefit pedestrian access. The bicycling council had reviewed the funds available and came up with a prioritized list of possible funding mechanisms. I

know you're looking to do an equitable distribution between districts rather than picking specific projects but because we'd submitted a resolution for -- a recommendation, I wanted to present it and give you insight into some of these projects. The project that was the highest priority is the upper body creek trail project and that ties into a large number of the criteria that are required by the capital metro funds criteria. It ties into the mlk station near mlk so the red line station as well as a bus transit system. One key piece of this project is that it was previously earmarked for funds through the creditant fund prior to those funds being removed to the rail bond. This project itself is -- is on a -- is fully shovel ready. All of those project projects are shovel ready. This project has a key aspect I think should be looked at as special, it requires a easement through private project donated by the Meredith foundation to the city than trail system, part of a master plan voted open by

[5:50:23 PM]

numerous neighborhood associations and we have multiple levels of support. Creative Meredith and the Sanchez neighborhood plans -- and this corridor is designed to connect the Mueller neighborhood down through the body creek green belt to the bicycle way to get you to ladybird lake and if the Meredith foundation due to long-term delays decides to redesignate what they're going do with the private property, it limits the city to find a way to implement that corridor plan. And that's in district one, a \$1.6 million project. The second one is the Austin bike share expansion which touches a large number of districts and I think -- he's up to talk so I won't cover that one and then there's a pleasant valley road, that's a \$3 \$3 million project to improve the ability for all modes to access the long horn dam, pedestrian and bicycle and automobile. And the country club creek trail project which is a large mobility project in southeastern Austin, southeast Austin, which involves both mobility for the general population as well as connectivity to schools. And I believe the gentleman from that neighborhood, who's been overseeing that, so I won't go into depth on that. Do you have any questions about these recommendations? >> Kitchen: I don't, but thank you for the work. This is helpful and I don't think it's inconsistent with the motion on the table in terms of where we might be -- you know, where we might be using these funds so -- if you have

[5:52:23 PM]

questions. >> Gallo: The last two that you spoke with, are they in. >> The fourth one would be in district 2. Councilmember Renteria's neighborhood and the number three would also be in that one. It's an interesting project because it's a dam over the pleasant valley bridge really is longhorn dam. I think that's in district three as well. Well. But I'm not sure. >> Gallo: Okay. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. >> Zimmerman: I've had a number of constituents suggest to me that the long horn dam had a failure that helped to contribute to the flooding backup on ladybird lake. Have you heard anything about that? >> That was the one about a year ago, long horn dam is a big issue for long-term maintenance and accessibility. There's floodgates of people crossing the bridge due to the improved boardwalk and the sidewalk that goes across it is substandard and does not allow two-way passage for the pedestrians themselves without turning side ways -- sideways. There's multiple issues that need to be involved. >> And the flood -- resolved. >> The flooding issues shall very serious. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Elliott Mcfadden. >> Councilmembers, my name is Elliott Mcfadden, the executive director of Austin b-cycle.

[5:54:24 PM]

I wanted to tell you a little bit about the program and why we're looking at this fund. Austin B like is a

public-private partnership with the city and bike share of Austin. Which is a local nonprofit that operates the system on behalf of the city. It's owned by the city and it's a city asset. The initial system was funded by \$2 million federal grant that call Poe awarded in 2011 and \$1.5 million was federal money and bike share of Austin raised the additional \$3,500,000 in private funds. We launched in December 2013 with 11 stations and quickly grew to 40 stations which was covered by the grant and ended up being more efficient with those funds and grew the system to 44 stations and added two more with additional funding. And we have five more stations designed to go in the summer. That are being leveraged as part of a grant we've received through the better bike share partnership. To address equity issues, basically enrolling more low-income families in the bike share program. As a low-cost transportation solution. The first year was successful. We have doubled projections and looked at other cities that are similar to Austin with bike share, based our projections on that and doubled 157,000 trips that year and we beat New York City for the most checkouts in a single day per bike and we're very sustainable system, covering 90% of our precipitations with user revenue which is the best rate in the industry right now and we're changing the way people along at transportation. We've done multiple surveys of our riders with a 94% approval rate among riders. And we've also -- they've indicated 26% of the trips

[5:56:26 PM]

they're taking they would have used a car so we're removing car trips and 44% are more likely to use transit having used b-cycle. It's a popular and sustainable program, however, we're not at a place right now where the system can sustain growth based just on the revenue from users and sponsors. So we took a look at areas where we could sustainably grow the system, where we could also increase our presence in -- on the equity side, providing again low-cost transportation for low-income families. And also where we have active interest from stakeholders to put in matching funds that we could leverage and so the proposal that you have that was approved by the bicycle advisory council is a 32 station expansion and we're about as shovel ready as it gets. The vast majority the locations don't require construction and those that do it's a sidewalk expansion and stations can be ordered and installed within an eight-week period and we're a key part of the transit solution so we expand the service area that transit has by being a first mile, last mile connection. So not only providing the short trip solution within neighborhoods but also improving accessibility to transit and with that, I would open it up to questions. You see a map there with those stations, there are five council districts that are covered by this proposed expansion. Conferences thank you very much. Any questions? No? >> Zimmerman: This looks like it's pretty much all in district nine, right?

[5:58:26 PM]

>> No, sir, it's district 10, 9, 1, 3 and 5. >> Zimmerman: Okay, I'll have to look at it some more. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Okay, next is Gerard Kenney. And dick Kellerman after him. >> Thank you, I'm Gerard Kinney, I serve on the evidence advisory council but we haven't taken any votes so I'm not represented them directly. You you heard earlier from Hayden walker who is chair and if you have questions, we can both address them. I have -- first of all, I want to personally thank rob spillar for thinks recommendations. I think at this point, it's about sidewalks and beacon as things like that are on point and give a good way to distribute these -- these funds among projects in all of the districts. My personal recommendation to the pedestrian advisory council has included pedestrian advisory beacons and there are other crossing AIDS in addition to that, that are in that family, that I think would be a good bang for the bucks with this -- these funds, but then also sidewalk gaps. One. The big problems throughout the city is we know that we need many, many more sidewalks, but there are a lot of places where there were sidewalks and there are gaps in the sidewalks and targeting those gap was some of these funds

would be a really good idea. I'm -- I also want to second

[6:00:26 PM]

Hayden's comments about -- she was recommending that we not rely just on bond elections for sidewalks. And I agree with that. We do need to rely on bond elections for some sidewalks on projects but there's a whole myriad of sources of funding and we at the pedestrian advisory council are working hard on that and coming back to recommend ways of funding pedestrian facilities in general, including sidewalks. But, I think this quarter cent tax is a good place to start. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Mr. Kellerman and last speaker will be malcolmyatees. >> Thank you, councilmembers. I'm transportation chair of the Austin Sierra club. And we've had marvelous ideas for using this money. Most of them, there's no argument. I'd like to throw in another option. We've had -- this money was for urban mass transit. And we have two shots at it, in 2000, it was voted down and just last November, it was voted down again. That doesn't mean we don't need it. We've needed it for decades and decades. It's getting worse. Urban mass transit is madly -- badly needed. We were talking about light rail and nine mile, the bridge, there was a tunnel, it was a lot of money, that's not necessarily what urban mass transit requires. We could do streetcars rather than light rail which is considerably cheaper. It doesn't have to be nine mile, it could can four or five miles right in the city.

[6:02:27 PM]

No tunnels, no bridges. So my suggestion is that we put that money on the shelf and don't kiss it off. Don't kiss off urban mass transit as it appears we're doing by distributing that money. If we put it on a shelf where it could collect interest it would be a continuous reminder that that's what that money was for and it's still required. And maybe would get us back on the right track again so that we can finally get what we really need, so all of the uses are actual uses. I think this is the primary use, I don't know if it's possible to do that, but it certainly would give the message that we know we need and here's some money, by the way, if it's a small use, it's a pretty good chunk of seed money for some mass transit. So if we could only hold it on the shelf, I think that's what we should do. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Let's see. I would simply say I appreciate your comments about transit and supporting transit. I think that -- that it's possible to use these funds within the different districts to help support transit. Because really -- transit is not going to work if we don't have a connected system and part of the problem we have going on right now within neighborhoods and with different parts of town where people can't get to the bus stop for example because they can't walk because the sidewalk doesn't work or there isn't a sidewalk or there may be other issues like that. There may be other aspects if we look into the specific districts and neighborhoods about the --

[6:04:30 PM]

right now, might actually be the best use of those dollars and could be used in a way that could support moving toward transit, I suggest you think about that aspect. >> That's good, I just don't want to forget urban rail which is what it was for. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Our last speaker is malco Yates. >> Thank you, my name is Malcolm Yates. I'm the chair of the east river side combined neighborhood planning area contact team. The residents of southeast Austin would like the mobility committee to consider using some of the cap metro quarter cent funds to complete the country club creek trail. This shows the -- it has the highest population density in Austin Toa to the number of apartment complexes, they're mainly low-income or students. The area has no trail system. The need for a trail system in the southeast central Austin area, the country club creek trail was identified as one of the top goals of the erk

neighborhood plan. You can see why a trail system is needed. It's cut up into large apartment complexes and small residential neighborhoods. The streets in these apartment complexes and neighborhoods are designed to avoid cut-through traffic. The design forces bike riders to

[6:06:33 PM]

use major arterial roads like south pleasant valley road to reach parks and stores. These roads have speed limits of 35 miles an hour to 45 miles an hour which makes them dangerous for children. For these reasonings, the neighborhood formed a group and built the first section with instances at lake shore, the baseball field and el mar drive and our goal is to connect the two major parks to the apartment complexes and neighborhoods along country club creek. The city built a section as part of the extension of south Pleasanton pleasant valley road and the city later built the underpass as part of a bridge repair project and committing the project west to maybe Davis park. The critical section that still needs to be completed is the section between the el Mont entrance to the trail. This slide shows the underpass over country club creek. Completing this section will give the greatest return on investment. Because it will allow the many residents of south Riverside to access parks and stores north the Riverside by using this existing underpass. This is the interchange at south pleasant valley road. It's a major obstacle to mobility-impaired residents and turn lanes on all four corners. It has the heightest -- this trail is important to more than just the area. The trail acts as a gateway to the butler trail around lady bird lake for all of the neighborhoods around southeast

[6:08:34 PM]

Austin. This sho slide shows how the recently completed bike lanes on the nut section of the south pleasant valley road connects womb son creek, onion creek and Mckinnie falls trail system to the country club creek trail and from there to the butler trail and to all of the other trail systems in Austin that connect to the Busler trail. In other words, this small segment of trail will benefit residents in districts 2, 3, and 5. The next slides show the preliminary engineering review of the trail section the elmont entrances. There's an engineer design completed sometime in 2016. This slide shows the estimates of the construction of the sections. Do you have any questions? Thank you for listening. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much >> Zimmerman: Which have councilmember district -- >> The country club trail -- creek trail is in district three. >> Zimmerman: Three? >> And then it connects to the Williamson creek trail that goes into district five. >> Zimmerman: Five. >> And district two. >> Zimmerman: Okay, thanks. I mean, I think the idea that we ought to -- that we had of breaking up the funds, this is what it it's about, it allows the council districts to prioritize where they want the money to go. >> Kitchen: What I would recommend, assuming that we vote for this motion that's on the table. That the -- that the projects being proposed to us and that we've heard from you all, be included in the list of potential projects and that this information go forward to the

[6:10:35 PM]

council when we bring -- just as an example. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Do we have more discussion on the motion? All in favor, please raise your hands. The. All in favor? Thank you. >> Before you adjourn, assume -- items 10 and 11 will be postponed to the August, but that hees item eight that we need direction from you also. >> Kitchen: Oh, August also. >> I think we've got it all. Thank you. >> Kitchen: All right, thank you all very much. I guess we're adjourned.